

THE  
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

---

APRIL, 1872.

---

I.—RELIGION, STATE, AND SCHOOL.

WHILE it is true that the child possesses all the faculties of the man, still, some propensities predominate in childhood that often fall into the background in manhood; and others that were scarcely perceptible in childhood become leading powers in after life. In like manner, while it is true that men have always been the same in all ages, and all states of society, and stages of development, still, certain faculties have exerted a controlling influence in the early history of humanity, that have afterward fallen into the background, and others that were then in abeyance have now assumed the control.

Man has always, in all ages, in all states of society, and under all stages of development, been a religious being; but religion has not always exerted the same relative influence over him, nor has its development been the same in all ages. In childhood, spirituality, or a belief and love of the marvelous, and veneration or respect for authority and submission to it, characterize all, and is a controlling influence. So in the early history of our race, and in ruder states of society, the predominance of these faculties is shown in an influence of the religious sentiment that is often degraded into superstition. In later life, the individual throws off this submission to some extent, but he should never attempt to emancipate himself from it. The authority that then controls him is of a higher character, and the

motives appeal to higher and broader influences, but he should never attempt to throw off all submission to any authority whatever. So as the race has grown older, and society has advanced, there has been a disposition to throw off the influence and restraint of authority, and especially religious authority.

But man can not eliminate the religious element out of his nature, nor should he attempt to emancipate himself from all religious influence, and to throw off all restraint of religious authority. His religion should be of a higher character, and its influence over him of a more elevated and elevating character; but he should not attempt to emancipate himself from all religious control. Every thoughtful student of universal history has observed, in this particular, a difference between the early periods of human history and the present—between ruder forms of society and those we regard as more enlightened. In all ancient nations, and especially in the infancy of the race, and in ruder states of society at the present time, religion has given rise to the government, has been its formative power and chief sanction, and has molded and regulated society. Such was the case in China, India, Persia, Chaldea, Palestine, Phœnicia, Egypt, Greece, Rome, and all of our ancestral European nations. The ancient lawgivers of those countries, such as Zoroaster, Moses, Numa, and Lycurgus, either followed their own intuitions, or they observed that men could be better controlled through the religious instinct than any other, when they assumed the divine origin and authority of their systems, and made religion the chief motive power and sanction of their codes; Moses had divine sanction for his course in doing so. Government, society, marriage, family, and even commercial transactions, were based on and controlled by religious authority and sanction. Religion molded the State, and then the State regulated and enforced religion.

All States had their systems of religion, and were intolerant of all others, because, as religion was a part of the government, opposing systems were rebellion against the government; and all religions were political in their character. We know that modern infidelity, in its assaults on the religions of the Bible, claims that it alone has given rise to persecutions, and that other systems have been tolerant of rival systems. There never was a greater mistake or perversion of facts. China and Japan have been and are even now

engaged in persecutions. India has been devastated by them. Zoroaster carried on one religious war, and his system has been at times fiercely intolerant. Egypt has been cited as an instance of religious toleration. On the contrary, it was often devastated by religious wars arising from the most trivial causes. Even philosophic Greece and politic Rome had numerous statutes enforcing submission to the religion of the state and forbidding other religions or infidelity to this religion, and persecuting with banishment or death those who disobeyed them; and such persecutions were common in all ages of those peoples. Mosaism partook largely of the same intolerant character. It was a politico-religious system. God was civil ruler of the Hebrews as well as their Deity; hence, infidelity to the Mosaic religion was treason as well as apostasy. Mosaism was a state molded and regulated by religion, and in turn the state protected and enforced this religion.

Christianity alone is an exception to this principle of intolerance. Its founder and his followers utterly ignored political power and influence, and any attempt to influence political action, where they labored and established their religion. It disclaims all such thought and action. It is not of this world in its instrumentalities, power, or sanction. Not that it has not had, and should not have political influence in its results. It has exerted a mightier influence than all other systems. It has by its eradication of human vices, its restraint of human passions, and by the influence of its great truths and the great duties it inculcates, secured to us our political, social, intellectual, domestic, and moral elevation. This is easily shown by the fact that wherever the Bible is known and read, and in proportion to its influence over the minds and hearts of the people, do these things exist. It could be easily shown, were it our aim now to do so, that this elevation is a result of which Christianity alone is the cause; by showing that Christianity eradicates the opposing vices, restrains the opposing passions, and inculcates those principles and duties that must produce such results. It determines the character of our political, social, domestic, intellectual, and moral life, not by directly controlling these institutions by its organism, the Church, nor by seizing the reins of government and schools, but by implanting in the heart of every man an indwelling molding power that will make him what he should be in all these relations.

The non-secular character of Christianity has secured religious freedom and toleration wherever it has to any extent been practiced in the purity of its principles, of charity, love, and philanthropy. Christianity alone has secured and produced modern toleration and freedom in religious matters. It alone has secured divorce of Church and State. But modern free thought is not satisfied with a mere severance of organizations, no matter how radical and thorough. It demands more than a divorce of Church and State organisms; it wants a complete elimination of all religious thought, influence, authority, and sanction, from state, society, family, and school, and no recognition of religion or religious ideas or authority in governmental action, or in political, social, or domestic life, or in our systems of instruction.

Government is in its organization, basis, sanction, authority, or action, to know nothing of religion. It is to be a kind of business compact, and to have no idea above mere worldly interests any more than a mercantile association. Marriage is to be a civil compact—a business transaction; an important one, it is true, but still a business transaction. The family is mere human association, and in the plans of some modern reorganizers, its place is to be taken by philansteries, where husband and wife, parent and child, are unknown terms; property is to be a common stock, in which no individual is to have a personal right to a certain definite portion acquired by his own labor, or by purchase or inheritance. Morality and obligation are to be based upon utility in the sense of what will gratify without injury, and not on religious authority or sanction. All religious ideas are to be eliminated from our system of instruction, with all ideas of causation or religious sanction and authority. We are to study the ongoing of events in their succession, learn to accommodate our lives to this, teach this in our instruction, and what is useful in the sense of what will gratify without injury, and construct family, school, society, and government on, and in accordance with, these fundamental ideas. Such a tendency of modern thought is seen in the late French revolution, especially in its last phase—communism; also, in English secularism, and much of modern German and American thought and speculation; it shows itself in the crusade against Sunday laws, and against religious thought or morality based on religious thought in our schools, and against recognition of religious ideas in our govern-



mental action. It has had its complete and logical development in French communism.

As these sentiments are rapidly spreading, especially seed-thoughts that produce such fruit, the necessity rests on all Christians to meet them and discuss them now. We must establish by observation, intuition, and experience, fundamental principles—go down to these in our discussions, and apply them to the solution of these vital questions. The question then is: "Shall government, society, family, and instruction be regarded as mere business associations or compacts, recognizing no higher principle than selfish utility in the sense of what will gratify without injury, or shall they in their very constitution, recognize the existence of God, the supremacy of his will, responsibility to him, and be based upon and regulated by these great principles, and be controlled and enforced by religious sanction?"

The question is not whether there shall be a union of Church and State as organizations. To divorce Church and State, it is not necessary to divorce the State from all principles of religion, from all idea of religion, and from all use of religious principles and sanctions; sectarianism and religious partyism are not Christianity, nor the Christian religion. To settle these questions, let us ask what kind of a being man is; what are his primal intuitions; and what are his wants, and how can they be met? Government, society, family, and instruction, to be suited to man, must recognize these primal intuitions, be based on them, and use them in meeting man's wants. They can not ignore the primal intuitions, rational, social, domestic, and religious, which are the basis of human nature, for they are intended to develop, regulate, discipline them, and protect us in their use. The positions men take on this question can be divided into four:

1. There are those who contend that man is an atheistic being; he is normally and naturally a being without religion. Religion is a perversion of veneration and marvelousness, just as polygamy and licentiousness are a perversion and abuse of the sexual instinct, and theft and extortion are a perversion of love of property, and tyranny and oppression are an abuse of proper ambition and love of power. And just as civilization has eradicated these abuses, or will do so, and give us absolute democracy, absolute free love, and community of goods, so it will and should eradicate all religion, and leave only

respect for age and excellence in man, and for the requirements of right and justice, and secure obedience to law and order. They tell us man has passed, in his career of progress, from idiotic savagery, or instinctive animalism in his development from lower animals, through fetichism and polytheism, into monotheism, and is destined to land in the glorious acme of atheism. Already a philosophic few have reached this sublime goal, and are beckoning to the mass of men to come up on that elevated plane of life and thought. Some of these regard religion, like polygamy, tyranny, and oppression, as abnormal and always evil. They denounce religion as always injurious to man in all conditions and states of society. They denounce Christianity especially with peculiar bitterness, as always injurious, as evil, and evil only, and that continually. Others regard all these things as normal to man in certain states of society and development, and as necessary and beneficial, and steps to higher condition of things. They charitably and complacently regard fetichism, polytheism, and monotheism, even in its highest development in Christianity, as useful and beneficial, and equally so, only in different periods of progress; but benignantly move them off the stage to make way for the glorious drama of atheism. Both of these parties agree that now all religion is to be cast aside. French communism denounced religion as now an obstacle to progress—a barrier in the way of human development—a robbery and a cheat, and with marriage, family, property, and central government, it must be put down. They were logical and consistent even if they were destructive.

2. There are those who look on man as a being who will have a religion, but he creates and develops this for himself as he does the family, society, or government. There is no revelation, no descent of God to man, but man raises himself to God, and fetichism, and polytheism, and monotheism are but the successive steps, and normal and necessary in their day and time. But in its perfect development religion will be a personal matter, an individual sentiment; and government, society, family, and instruction will have nothing to do with it, and it will have nothing to do with them. The divorce of Church and State, to be complete, must extend to a separation of the State from all religious ideas. The State can have no more to do with religion than it has with the wave or corpuscular theories of heat, or the undulatory or emission theories of light.

3. Those who believe man needs a revelation, and accept the Bible as such revelation, and their only perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. But observing how union of Church and State, State religion and State interference with religion, has always been fatal to both, they contend for a divorce as complete and as absolute as the other parties. Regarding religion as not secular in its character nor in its aims and instrumentalities, and as affecting moral and religious life in private relations alone, they contend that all religious ideas should be eliminated out of government, and its regulation of society, family, marriage, and systems of instruction. Let parents and religious teachers in family and Church inculcate religion, and let individuals live it in the Church and recognize silently its morality, authority, and obligations in their actions in State, society, and family; but let there be no recognition nor avowal of these principles and such authority and sanction in such action; nor by the government in its own organization or action prescribing or regulating the society, family, marriage, or systems of instruction. The government has no more to do with religion than it has with the Copernican theory of the universe.

4. Those who claim that government, society, family, marriage, and systems of instruction, should be based on a recognition of the existence of God, the supremacy of his will, as the only and infallible standard of right and wrong, responsibility to him as the great sanction of morality; and that they should be regulated and controlled by these great fundamental ideas, and enforced by religious authority and sanction. Those who take this position do not contend for a State Church, nor that the State should have a system of religious dogmas, just as the State has certain great regulative principles in finance and policy, which control its action without its descending into minute details, or espousing partisan systems, so it can and should have certain fundamental regulative religious principles without sectarianism or a State system of religious dogmas.

It will be observed that as widely as the first three parties differ in their ideas of religion and man's nature, they are a unit as to the relation religion should sustain to the State, society, and school. Whether they are equally consistent will be developed as we proceed with our discussion. Let us define two terms we shall use: 1. *Religion*. By religion we mean a sense of obligation and duty based

on the existence of God and our relation to him, and his authority in consequence of such relation ; and on his will—a sense and knowledge of good and evil based on his will and authority as a standard, and sanctioned by his rewards and punishments. 2. *Indispensable*. That without which another thing can not accomplish its purpose. Then, we ask, are not religious principles, ideas, and sanctions necessary as bases and as regulative powers, and as sanctions to government, society, family, and school ?

Let us first remove the conclusion the positivist claims to reach by appeals to history. Man did not and could not begin in a condition of idiotic savagery, or instinctive animalism, as a development from lower orders of animals, or lower types of the *genus homo*. Geology gives no traces of such transition of lower forms. Man is man as we now find him, wherever geology has placed his remains before us, and comparative physiology has determined his position in nature. As an idiotic savage he would exist only long enough to starve to death ; as an animal, controlled by instinct, he would exist no longer, for he has not in his organization the means of sustaining life as the animals sustain theirs. Man uses implements ; his faculties and his physical construction would not preserve his life without them, and reason to invent them and direct him in using them. Between the life of the most highly-favored animal controlled and perpetuated by instinct, and his organization furnished with the means of such perpetuation, and the lowest tribe of man controlled by reason and law, and his organization destitute of all means of such perpetuation, and by such means as are suited to the animal, there is an impassable gulf.

Nor is the Jewish Rabbinical idea that the first man was infinitely superior to his descendants in knowledge and wisdom, and that the first generations were superior to all who succeeded them in the same way, to be accepted as correct, or even possible. It could not have been the case, for knowledge is acquired by observation, study, and experience, and there had been no time or opportunity for such observation, reflection, and experience. The first man and woman must, from the very necessities of the case, have been created a full-grown man and woman, and in full perfection of their powers and faculties. They could have been instructed by their Creator, and could have taken care of themselves in no other case. Their mental and physical

powers were more active, acute, vigorous, and pure than those of any of their descendants, for they had not been weakened or depraved by sin, or the inherited effects of sin. But in acquired knowledge, they were very children; they were in a state of childlike innocence and simplicity. So says all history as retained in old traditions and religions, and these have in them an outline of truth. Man had, as his necessities demanded, angelic teaching and intercourse, and a common revelation, and his religion was monotheistic, simple, and childlike in its truths and requirements. So say traditions and the old historic religions all over the world. The leading ideas of these universal traditions are historic and true.

There is not in tradition, philology, archæology, or the historic religions of the world, the slightest trace of this universal ascent from fetichism through polytheism into monotheism, which must culminate in atheism. On the contrary, man descended from a pure, simple, monotheism into polytheism, and then to fetichism. He had at first angelic intercourse, as he must have had, and a common revelation and common religion. This common revelation and common religion was the basis of the historic religions of the world. In their migrations, the various families of men carried its great truths with them, and retained them to a greater or less degree in their descent into paganism. The master-minds of each nation took these great truths as the basis of the systems they elaborated for their people. In this way do we account for the universal prevalence of certain ideas and facts in all nations and religions. They were retained by tradition as relics of a common revelation and monotheistic religion, and were not borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures. Nor were these Scriptures made of plagiarisms from pre-existent paganism. God chose the family of Abraham as the depository of his religion because, as a pastoral tribe, they were purer than others, and had not corrupted this religion and revelation to the extent the inhabitants of the cities had done. In them he developed this system to perfection, and until it was ready to grapple with error, and while doing this, he prepared the Hebrews to be its missionaries. He scattered them by means of the captivities to which they were subjected, among all the leading nations of the then known world, and in the centers of trade and thought; and in that way he scattered Hebrew ideas and saturated the thought of the world with Hebrew prophecy, and prepared

in Jewish Synagogues as centers of preaching for the missionaries of the religion of Jesus.

As the religions of the primitive nations were constructed for them by master minds, they were at first in advance of the national thought and life, and there was growth and progress until the national life filled the mold thus prepared for it. Then the national religion, like the China-woman's shoe, checked further growth, and petrified and fossilized national life, as was the case in India and China; or national thought cast it off and launched into skeptical philosophy, as in Greece and Italy. The religion of the Bible alone has been a progressive religion. It has in the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian dispensations, advanced with humanity from its childhood through its youth into manhood. Indeed, its religions have ever been in advance of the national life, beckoning man up to a higher plane. It alone has passed from a few elementary truths and precepts, through a disciplinary law of positive commands and much service, into a law of great truths and universally applicable principles. Other religions never attained to universal truths and universally applicable principles.

History declares that all historic religions were originally monotheistic. So does comparative philology, archæology, and a comparison of old historic religions. Paul's account, as given in the first part of his Roman letter of the descent of man from the worship of God, through the worship of gods like corruptible man, into the worship of four-footed beasts and creeping things, or from monotheism through polytheism into fetichism, can be clearly traced in history, archæology, and a comparison of historic religions and religious life of old nations, and especially in comparative philology.

The Semitic tribes separated the attributes of God from him and each other, and deified them and worshiped them. Such is the significance of the names of their chief gods. The Aryan nations deified the forces of nature as representative of these attributes of God. Such was the significance of the early worship of India, Persia, and Greece. In Greece they sometimes elevated their heroes and leaders to the rank of gods, and either by confounding them with the deified forces of nature, or because their characters were analogous to these deified forces, they substituted them for the one God, and the forces of nature as representative of his attributes. By person-



ifying the attributes of God, or the forces of nature as representing them, and by taking men and certain animals or combinations of their forms, as representatives of such personified attributes, men sank into fetichism in its most bestial and degraded form. In Egypt, fetichism in its most degraded form was reached, and in Chaldea, Phoenicia, Greece, and Rome, in the deification of rivers and fountains, and in the half animal and monstrous forms given to their gods, the same degraded level was reached, though to a less extent. Even Jupiter, the chief Grecian deity, was disfigured with ram's horns on his head, and other approximations to fetichism. These things existed in the palmiest days of their civilization and refinement.

To the assertion that man began in fetichism, and passed through polytheism to monotheism, we reply with these facts of history, archæology, comparative philology, and comparative religion. We urge, also, that so far from these forms of religion succeeding each other in the order the positivist asserts, they have existed contemporaneously in all ages, and lands, and states of society, and development. Not one instance can be given of a people that has passed through these forms of religious advancement by force of intellectual growth and civilization. There never has been an instance of spontaneous civilization. Every instance that can be cited of such development has been caused by an external power imported into national life, and all religious advancement by a power imparted by the Hebrew Scriptures. It is not true that fetichism is peculiar to barbarism, and that as nations advance they rise into polytheism and then into monotheism. Fetichism and polytheism have controlled some of the most enlightened nations; while monotheism was the religion of people who were, in comparison with them, rude and barbarous. Nations have descended into polytheism and fetichism while retaining all their former civilization. Egypt, Chaldea, and Greece are examples. Man has never been able to emancipate himself from the thralldom of idolatry. On the contrary, while advancing intellectually and in elegance and luxury, he has become more corrupt and effeminate morally, until his moral corruption has poisoned, vitiated, and destroyed his civilization, and he has, by his corruption and effeminacy, sunk back into barbarism. Then, we repeat, there is no instance of spontaneous civilization, or spontaneous advancement from fetichism through polytheism into monotheism. Even if all the positivist claims concerning



such development were true, it by no means follows that atheism is to be the goal. To refute this and to discuss intelligently the claim that government, society, and instruction should be free from all religious ideas, let us inquire what kind of being man is. We then affirm:

1. Man is a religious being, a worshiping being, and we sustain our position by these considerations. Phrenology, which we hold to be true in its leading ideas, tells us that man has veneration and spirituality. The highest and only complete and proper object of spirituality is spiritual life and thought. The highest and only complete and proper object of veneration is God. God as an infinite spirit, ideas connected with him, worship of him, or religion, are the only adequate objects of these faculties of our nature. Then, if our nature be true, there is a God and there is spiritual existence and life to meet and satisfy the demands of this part of our nature. Mental philosophy constructed independent of phrenology, teaches the same great fundamental truth. Man is a worshiping being, and one who recognizes the existence of spirit and spiritual life. In all ages, lands, states of society, and stages of development, man has worshiped, has had his religious notions and his ideas of religious and spiritual life and existence. No nation or tribe can be mentioned that is an exception. It has been supposed that exceptions have been found, but such conclusions were caused by lack of proper understanding of their language or lack of sense in the inquirers, who proposed theological dogmas to the people, and mistook ignorance of these for atheism. Let any one who thinks he can do so, attempt to name an atheistic tribe, and we will agree to give him their ideas of spiritual life, their religious systems, and in most instances, their names for the Supreme Being.

Deaf mutes are an evidence of the truth of our position. A most conclusive instance of this is the case of G. W. Steenrood, brought forward by Alexander Campbell in the appendix to his debate with Owen, to prove exactly the contrary. He made an intelligent personal god of the sun. The intuitive principle of causation, and his veneration and spirituality, compelled him to recognize the existence of an Intelligent Cause. Hence, we affirm man is as essentially a religious being as he is a rational or a social being. There are atheists as there are hermits, but they are abnormal exceptions arising from imperfect development, or a perversion of these powers.

We do not claim that man, without revelation, has or can have a correct knowledge of God. On the contrary, we do not believe that such is the case. But revelation was not given to reveal God's existence, but his character and his plan of redemption. On the other hand, idolatry and fetichism no more prove man to be an atheistic being, and destitute of religion, than polygamy and tyranny prove that the family and government are not relations that he will instinctively assume. Idolatry, polygamy, and despotism are perversions of these primal intuitions, but the intuitions exist and can be traced even in these perversions. Then we conclude man is a worshiping being, and has a religious and spiritual nature.

2. Man becomes like the being he worships. His Deity is his highest conception and embodiment of wisdom, justice, and power, and of course his highest authority and standard in morality. Man's religion then is his standard of morality—determines for him what is right, and his moral character. Reason does not determine his moral character, for man is not exclusively a rational being. He has an animal nature, or passions, that often bias and overwhelm his reason; an emotional nature that often does the same thing; and a religious nature whose supremacy is always acknowledged by his reason. Reason has never been satisfied in settling what is right and wrong. It has never been content with its own decisions; it has never been satisfied with its solutions of the question, "What makes one thing right and another wrong?" It has always groped around for a higher and a satisfactory authority. Even if it could infallibly settle this question, it has not authority to give sufficient sanction to its decisions to secure the submission of passion and will. A knowledge of the truth never made any one a particle better. It is not the truth believed, but the truth obeyed and made a living, vitalizing, energizing principle in life and conduct, that makes men better. Reason can not give to the truth, even could it infallibly discover all truth, authority, and sanction sufficient to make it such, a rule of life. Conscience is not this needed authority or sanction. It is not a moral instinct that tells us infallibly what is right and what is wrong, and irresistibly impels us to obey its decisions. It is a faculty that impels us to do what reason, or religion, or some other authority pronounces to be right, and that approves our conduct when we do it, and that reproves us when we fail to do this, or when we do what

they pronounce to be wrong. Paul's conscience approved of his persecuting the Church at one time, and afterward of his giving his life for it at another. The conscience of the Hindoo mother impels her to tear her babe from her bosom and throw it into the jaws of the monster basking in the sacred river. The conscience of the Christian mother impels her to rear her babe in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Conscience in each case submits to and obeys what it regards a higher guide; so does reason in each case. Both reach out for and feel round after a higher guide.

What then is this higher power or guide? It is religious authority and sanction. Because an infinitely wise, powerful, and just God has approved of and commanded certain things, reason and conscience accept his will and rest satisfied with it, as an infallible standard, such as they ever feel after and will always accept and obey, when they believe they have it. Then, just as the child becomes like the parent, and the pupil like the teacher, so pre-eminently does a worshiper become like the being he worships. It is often said that instead of God making man in his image, man has ever made his god in his image.

While it is true that if man were left to himself to determine God's character or attributes from Nature and from his own mental and moral characteristics, these characteristics would very materially influence his decisions; still, this does not destroy our argument. The minds who attempt to determine God's character in this way are comparatively few. These few master-minds have constructed for the millions their religion, and in this way determined their character. The position that man invariably makes God in his own image denies that there is an objective standard of truth. We might as well say the child makes the parent in his own image, and the pupil in like manner makes the character of the teacher, as to assert that man invariably makes God in his own likeness. We might as well say that the character and teachings, and authority of the parent or teacher, do not mold the character of the child or pupil, as to say man's system of religion does not determine his moral character. Then we affirm that religious authority and sanction determine for man what is right and wrong, and are his standard in determining these things, and are the formative and regulative power in determining his character and life. Then, to control man in such a way

as to secure right conduct, life, and development, man must have a pure object of worship, to whose character he can assimilate his own life and character. This object of worship must reveal his character and his will, prescribing man's duty to his God, his fellow-man, and himself, with adequate sanctions; or, in other words, for man's control and development, he must have a pure system of religion, with pure principles, pure rites, and proper sanction. This religion will be the standard of right and wrong, and furnish man with those great principles that are needed to satisfy reason and conscience, and that will have sufficient authority to control man's animal and emotional natures; or religion is man's controlling and regulative power. His religious nature is the regnant part of his being, and must be recognized and made such, in all fundamental relations, and whatever power controls and regulates these relations.

Let us here drop a correlative thought. Man can not originate or discover a pure object of worship. He is impure himself, and so are all his fellow-men. No man can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, a pure character out of those that are impure. Man has never emancipated himself from the impurities of idolatry. There is no language on earth that contains a term exactly equivalent to the Scriptural attribute, holiness, except those in which the Scriptures were revealed, or into which they have been translated; and in the latter case it takes generations to elevate some word in those languages, by illustration, and Scriptural study, and Christian life, to an expression of this attribute of God. God's natural attributes are seen in nature, but his moral attributes must be revealed. Hence, as one of the wisest of the ancients said: "The utmost that man can do, is to attribute to the God he devises the same attributes, the same vices and imperfections he finds in himself, giving to them divine power and authority, and then become more corrupt by their reflex action on his nature in his worship of them." Then we not only prove the supremacy of man's religious nature and the necessity of making it the regulative principle and authority in government and in instruction, but we also prove the necessity of a revelation, and that we should find in that revelation such principles and authority. Next, we affirm that the Bible is a revelation from God, and such a revelation as he needs. In Christianity, the perfect development of the religion of the Bible, we have such a religion as man needs, and must

have for his control and development. It reveals a pure, holy, wise, merciful, and good object of worship, who is infinite in power, perfection, and attributes. It reveals a pure and perfect rule of conduct for man's government and life, as a standard of right, as a declaration of God's will. It gives clear, simple, and infallible *criteria* for deciding what is right and what is wrong, and places on these decisions the sanctions of the will of an infinitely wise, just, good, and powerful God, and gives to his will the sanctions of the rewards of eternal life, or the punishment of eternal death. Or Christianity is a pure system of religion, with perfect principles of right and wrong, and perfect rules of conduct, perfect rites and adequate sanctions, and authority.

Now we are ready to affirm that since government must be based on the primal intuitions of our nature and agree with them, it must be based upon and regulated by these great truths established by the religious intuitions of our nature. It must recognize the existence of God and his will as the great source and standard of justice, morality, and authority, the fundamental sanction of all authority. It must recognize and use these great truths as regulative formative influences and principles in its action in regulating society, family, and public instruction. Government, society, family, marriage, and instruction, must be based upon, formed, regulated, and sanctioned by these great truths. Such must be the case if they are based on the primal intuitions of our nature, and are adapted to our nature and wants. We can no more ignore the religious instinct than we can the social instinct.

We are now ready to submit the following queries: Is not religious principle, a religious basis, necessary for the proper formation of the government of our country? Is not Christianity thus necessary as a basis? Can our government be properly constituted and administered without being based on and recognizing the great principles of religion and morality found in Christianity? Or shall not we be a Christian nation, avowedly so, in our government? Shall we recognize God's existence and authority, and our relation and obligations to him, and the supremacy of his will in our legislation and governmental action? Are government, marriage, family, society, and property divine institutions, based on and regulated of necessity by these great religious principles and the fundamental religious

intuitions of our nature; or, are they mere associations, with no higher sanction than selfish utility? These questions are fundamental to all reasoning on society and government, and should be settled before we attempt to construct or regulate either.

Let us try the effect of eliminating all idea of God and his will—all religious thought, or standard authority and sanction from our governmental action. We are told, "Law is our expression of the supreme authority of the State, enacting what is right and forbidding what is wrong." All very fine. But how shall the State decide what is right and what is wrong? How shall it determine what makes one thing right and another wrong? What shall be the standard? To what authority shall it appeal to satisfy the reason and conscience of its subjects? We are further told, "Enactments opposed to and subversive of fundamental morality are void." This statement is also as fine as the former; but how shall we decide what is fundamental morality? "Why," says one, "let the majority rule." That is but another form of saying might makes right. "The voice of the people is the voice of God." The voice of the people is the voice of God when they speak as God speaks, and only then. "And they cried, crucify him! crucify him!"

There are several standards of morality, but that which seems to be most clamorous now for an exclusive monopoly of all authority is selfish prudence. We are to do that which will secure the greatest gratification without any, or with the least, injury. Another is the greatest good of the greatest number. Do that which will secure the greatest good of the greatest number. Another is the fitness of things. Do that which accords with the fitness of things. Another is the will of God. Do that which accords with the will of an absolutely wise, just, good, and holy God. What then shall be the standard in deciding what is right, and what shall be the sanction of law? Selfish prudence? æsthetic result? or divine will?

It is a vital question: Can the State exist without a sense of right and wrong, duty and obligation, reward and punishment, among the people? Shall not these ideas be the basis of all governmental action? Certainly they must, every one will reply. Then comes the all-important question: What shall be the standard in settling these questions? We will decide this in a subsequent part of this article. Another thought that is worthy of the thoughtful consideration of



all—all the early governments of men were based on the idea of there being a revelation, and attempted to derive their authority from that idea. All governments since have more or less relied on this idea except the two atheistic French governments, and they were short-lived failures. Does not such universal action amount to a declaration of universal intuition, that religion is necessary as a basis, a formative power and regulative principle, and a sanction of government? The chief atheists of the first French revolution admitted this after a disastrous experiment in attempting to eliminate all religious ideas out of government and society.

Closely connected with this is the question: "Is not the idea and belief that religion is a divine revelation necessary to its authority and efficiency, as a basis and regulative power? Is it not so necessary that government can not ignore such a standard and sanction? Does not the universal action of governments and legislators in all ages establish this as a truth?" Let us inquire what the State does, or attempts to do. The State acts, enacts, adjudicates, executes, restrains, punishes, rewards, incorporates, grants, devises, wars, makes peace, makes treaties and alliances, regulates industry and commerce, individual relations, conduct and rights, educates, regulates marriage, family and society, and political relations, coerces rebels and criminals, pardons and amnesties them, levies taxes, imposts, and military service, and assumes obligations affecting every person in every relation and right. Must it have no standard, no rule, no regulative principle in all this work? To say the will of the majority must decide is not enough. That is only another form for the tyrant's doctrine, "might makes right." How can the majority be induced to always decide right, to respect the rights of the minority? What must be the standard of right in the State? Force or justice? If the latter, what shall be standard in deciding what is just? As we have shown, religion is the regnant influence in man's nature—the regulative principle of his life. Religious principles decide for man what is right and wrong. Respect for revealed religion is an intuition of our nature. All governments, with two exceptions, and these were failures, have recognized this in their action. Government, if based on and suited to man's nature, can not ignore these truths.

Christianity is confessedly the highest type of revealed religion—of the professedly revealed religions. It has, by the influence of its



great principles and truths, prepared the way for and secured the best results of human effort in government, society, and intellectual progress. If it has done this as a creative power, and its influence is needed as a conservative power and a continual creative force, our State should be a Christian State then, and recognize the great principles of Christianity as its standard in legislation, jurisprudence, and administration. The State must have a conscience in all its acts. It must have a conscience enlightened by religious truth, based on religious principle, and regulated and controlled by religious authority and sanction. We are not contending for a State religion, or system of religious dogmas; nor a State Church, nor State support of a Church, or religious party; but for the recognition of the great truths of religion as a standard in controlling the action of the State, and in deciding the questions of right and justice. Such should be the case, because religion is man's standard in settling these questions.

Our Government recognizes these truths to a certain extent now, in its action in requiring an oath of office, a solemn religious act, and in requiring religious sanction in all testimony; also, in the chaplain's office in several departments of government, and in its ceasing to work in several of its departments on Sunday, and in its Sunday laws; also, in the public fasts and thanksgivings it ordains. In the earlier and better days of our nation, this was the case to an extent that would now be denounced as Puritanism. In Revolutionary times the action we contend for was universal, and was looked upon as fully as necessary as the recognition of the great principles of law and order. What is now sneeringly called Puritanism was then the controlling influence in our national councils and governmental action.

All great jurists and writers on jurisprudence, from Montesquieu and Sir Matthew Hale, down through Blackstone and Lord Mansfield to Kent and Story of our nation, have unhesitatingly and invariably given the great truths and principles of the Christian religion as the basis of all law and jurisprudence. They have appealed to it as the standard, and its authority as the highest sanction. They speak with severity and often with contempt of the standards modern infidelity is now seeking to substitute instead. It is quite fashionable now to sneer at Puritanism, and in certain circles it is

regarded as a sufficient condemnation of an opinion to sneer at it as Puritanic. Doubtless there was fanaticism and some cant in Puritanism, and the Puritans often ran to extremes; but we would suggest that we owe our republican institutions and religious freedom to Luther, Calvin, Milton, Locke, Sydney, Hampden, and the Puritans, and not to the godless, irreligious cavaliers of the courts of the Charleses, nor to the profligate writers of the skeptical schools. Had it not been for Puritanism, our Revolution would have ended as did the French Revolution. Puritanism has given us our freedom, education, order, morality, and intellectual vigor; it has made us what we are, and it betrays ignorance or unfairness to now sneer at it.

German Rationalism, foreign irreligion, and our own infidelity are striving to organize a crusade against what remains of the influences that were the basis of our colonial settlements and institutions, and which created the influences that culminated in our Revolution, and controlled and regulated it, and made it successful. They would drag us down to the licentious level of the irreligious communities out of which they come. They have been attracted to our country by the superiority of our institutions over their own, and then, with a strange fatuity, try to destroy the influences that have produced this very superiority.

The American people have to decide whether our Christian Lord's-day shall be degraded into a day of dissipation; whether the influences of our national institutions, of preaching, prayer, praise, and Lord's-day schools, with all their powerful influences in producing and maintaining a religious and moral tone of society, shall yield to the theater, beer-garden, horse-racing, target-shooting, drinking, and carousing, with all their lawless, debasing influences. It is a question of national life to us. Shall the institutions and influences that have secured to us our political, educational, domestic, and moral pre-eminence among the nations of the earth be allowed to preserve this superiority, and to exert their elevating power? or, shall we allow those who have only intelligence enough to be attracted by our superiority, and have not discernment enough to perceive to what it is due, to drag us down to their own level? If these persons can not submit to the restraints necessary to preserve the very things that attracted them to our shores, let them stay away, and permit us to retain our institutions and the influences which created and which

alone can preserve them. While we may condemn the sternness of the old New England Puritanic *régime*, still we infinitely prefer it with these blemishes to the lawlessness and license of modern infidelity. Give us the purity of old New England life with all its stern Puritanism, rather than its modern licentiousness, its free love and divorces, and the destruction of the family—once the glory of New England.

We now come to our second query: "Can the State establish a system of public instruction and keep it free from all religious influences? Must not all education be based upon, and be permeated by principles of religion?" To settle this question, let us inquire what is an education, and what are the objects of the State in educating the youth? We understand an education in its true significance to be an awakening, a drawing out, an expanding, a developing and disciplining of every power of body, soul, and spirit, so as to secure a full, harmonious, and complete development of the whole man. Its design is to make man as perfect as a man as he can be; to fit him to discharge every duty in every relation in life in the best possible manner—his duty to God, his duty to his fellow-man, his duty to himself; to make him as useful as he can be; to render him as happy as he can be; to fit him to make his fellow-man as happy as he can be; to fit him to love the Lord his God with all his might, mind, and strength, and his neighbor as himself.

The objects of government in educating the youth of the State are: to secure to every one the enjoyment of an inestimable right; to fit every one to discharge his duties as a citizen; to secure its own efficient organization, action, administration, and its own perpetuity; to promote the public welfare. The government then must secure the impartation of such an amount of instruction, and such kind of instruction as will accomplish these great ends. We should use all means necessary to secure these ends. Now comes the all-important query, what kind of instruction will secure, is necessary to secure, these ends? Mere knowledge imparted by secular instruction will not. Knowledge is but an increase of power, and whether it be a good or an evil, depends on the use made of it. Whether it be used to promote the great ends of government in educating its youth, or to defeat them, depends on the character of those who are educated. Without morality to regulate and control its use, secular knowledge

will be an unmixed curse. It must have a moral basis, a moral frame-work running through it, a moral regulative principle, a moral power molding and controlling it and its use.

We repeat, then, that the great object of the government in educating the youth of the State is to fit them to discharge their duties as citizens of the State, and in this way to secure its own proper and efficient organization, action, administration, and its perpetuity, and to prevent crime, and to promote the general welfare. Integrity and morality are absolutely essential to these ends. They are more essential than mere secular instruction, for governments have existed without secular instruction or systems of secular instruction, but governments never existed without fundamental morality. What will secure this fundamental morality? Not mere secular instruction. Nor will the enunciation or inculcation of moral maxims, no matter how correct they may be, nor how carefully they may be instilled in the mind. A mere knowledge or a mere belief of the truth never made any one one whit the better. These truths must be so enforced as to become a rule of life. They must become a vital, energizing principle in life and conduct. They must have authority and sanction sufficient to make them such a rule in life and conduct. An efficient system of instruction must be based on proper fundamental principles; must be based on the primal intuitions of our nature, and must use them in its work. Let us recur then to first principles as we have already established them.

Man is a religious being, and his religion determines his conduct and character. Religion is his standard in determining what is right and wrong, the great sanction of the right. Then religion must be the basis, the frame-work, the formative power and the molding and regulating principle of all education, and its standard of morality. Religious motive alone can give to moral truth adequate sanction. Religious motive and moral instruction is needed to prevent the development of evil propensities and habits, and to save from error and evil. They are so necessary that the State can not neglect them in its system, for if it does, such system of instruction will fail to accomplish its end.

It will not do to say, let the State impart secular instruction and let the parent and the Church impart moral and religious instruction; for moral and religious instruction is the most essential, is absolutely

essential to the very purposes for which the State educates. It alone can make secular education accomplish the purposes for which the State educates. If the State can not trust the least important to others, why should, how can it trust the most important? If the State can not impart the most important, why can it the least important, especially since the more important alone can make the less beneficial for the very ends for which the State educates?

We have systems of morality now in our schools, and in our courses of instruction, and in our popular reading. We have heathen systems of morality now in our schools, in our Greek and Latin classics, and in ancient history. Their standard we all know to be deficient and corrupt, and not only unworthy of our system of instruction, but positively injurious. How shall we correct this but by a proper standard and system of morals? Infidel systems are corrupting our instruction through the reading of our youth and the influence of teachers who have imbibed such systems. Both need the correction of a proper system of moral instruction. We need in our system of education, to enable it to accomplish its true ends, instruction in history, science of government, political economy, and morality, so as to secure that intelligence, patriotism, and integrity in each pupil, that will fit him to discharge his duties as a citizen; as well as instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, and grammar. If instruction in these be needed to secure the very purposes sought to be accomplished by the State in educating the youth, it can no more afford to leave instruction, in these essentials, to chance, parental fidelity, Church, or benevolence, than it can instruction in the branches now required in our public schools. Can the State be content to leave to the fidelity and intelligence of parents and directors, or to chance, instruction in these essential subjects, any more than it can the qualifications of teachers, or whether there shall be instruction in the branches now required by law.

We have already decided by our legislation, that the State can not leave the qualifications of teachers, their moral character, and the branches now required by law, to parental fidelity or to the whims of directors, or to Church, or benevolence. Can it leave the more important, which alone can make what it now requires beneficial for the purposes for which the State provides the present instruction? Again, a teacher has to be qualified to govern a school, says the State

in the certificate it grants him. How is he to govern it? What must be the method he must use in order to be qualified to govern? Shall it be mere force? Mere mandatory rules and threatened penalty? Must not the State provide for the proper discipline of the schools it establishes, lest they become nurseries of lawlessness and evil? Shall the State be content to have the school governed by mere force, or command and penalty? Does not the State use preventive legislation? It certainly does in forbidding certain acts, publications, and exhibitions. Moral instruction is a chief means of preventing crime, and the State should secure it to all. The State can look to the increase of the happiness of all, and the promotion of the general welfare. Moral instruction is a chief means of accomplishing both these ends. Moral instruction would make secular instruction more efficient. It would make our schools more efficient in imparting secular instruction, and, indeed, is essentially necessary that they may do this successfully. Moral instruction would increase the happiness of the pupils. Finally, the State does now practically impart instruction and decide questions of morality and exert a moral influence in its penal legislation; but this is not sufficient either in school or State.

The real question then comes up: "How shall this moral instruction be imparted in our schools? By mere mandatory rules with threatened penalties?" This is not sufficient, for there is really no instruction in such a course. By mere statement of moral truths, or maxims without reason or authority? This is not sufficient, for there must be a reason for the truths and rules, a standard of authority, and an adequate sanction. What shall be the standard? Shall the teacher virtually make his will the standard and announce mere moral maxims or truths, without any other authority or reason to satisfy the reason and consciences of his pupils; or, shall there be a reason, a standard of authority, and a sanction that will satisfy reason and conscience, and secure true moral obedience, and make such instruction a rule of life?

Various standards have been proposed for man's guidance in determining whether a thing be right or wrong, and what makes it right or wrong. But, as already remarked, the one most clamorous now for an exclusive monopoly of authority, is that of selfish prudence. That is right which will secure the greatest amount of



selfish gratification without any, or with the least evil results. The settlement of every question of right and wrong is a kind of algebraic solution of a moral problem. In the solution we place all, or the greatest amount of gratification, on one side, and the course of conduct that will secure it, on the other; then eliminate all effects that will injure ourselves, and the solution is complete. This is the standard of the apostles of the modern positivist school and those who would make our system of education exclusively secular, or practical, as they term it. They would enforce morality by such impressive appeals as, "If you stick your finger in the fire you will be burned. If you eat too much you will have the dyspepsia or fever. If you commit adultery it will injure your health. If you would enjoy the greatest amount of gratification you must abstain from certain things called vices. You must study the ongoing of events in their succession, and learn to accommodate yourself thereto." "You must keep yourself in harmony with your environments," says a late apostle of this acme of human development. When a man commits murder he has got out of harmony with his environments, and the machine will surely punish him for not keeping step!

Such a standard might do for brutes, and it certainly would make brutes of men, if they were to attempt to practice it. It never discovered the ideas of vice and virtue, and it never arranged actions in the categories of vices and virtues. It has found this done by the higher principles, and it now attempts to dethrone those standards that have done what it never could do. It is now merely attempting to induce men to accept its brutal, selfish estimates as reasons instead of the higher motives that have done what it never would have suggested a thought of, and which it never could accomplish. Should they do so, an utter confusion of all vices and virtues, and a descent to the selfishness of the brutes will be the result. There is no restraint in such a standard. Human appetite and passion will urge that the greatest gratification is in vice, and when the apostles of this theory point to evil consequences that natural laws will inflict, they will reply: "We will look out for that; we can cheat blind, insensate nature out of this supposed penalty." Besides, they urge to the adulterer and libertine, "What punishment is there in your crimes? As far as punishment is concerned, we find our very gratification in these supposed punishments."



Again, this brutal standard destroys all idea of self-sacrifice and self-denial, and self-abnegation. Prudence is not the standard in the spirit's domain in its great crises. There are times when seeking the greatest gratification with the least evil results—when consulting prudence is the greatest of crimes. There are times when it is the spirit's duty to give the body to be burned—times when trampling under foot every consideration of prudence is the highest duty—the soul's most glorious opportunity. The martyr's crown, the patriot's laurel, the philanthropist's reward, are to be won only by an utter disregard of this idea of selfish prudence. It is the standard of the voluptuary, the sensualist, and the sybarite. In teaching men morality, we must teach them something more than to cheat blind, insensate nature out of the greatest amount of gratification with the least injurious effects to ourselves. Would such standards as this have given us a Paul, a Savonarola, a Luther, a Martyn, or a Howard?

Another standard is the fitness of things. This is very beautiful in sound, but very vague in sense. In what does this fitness consist? What makes things fit to be done, and others unfit to be done? What is the principle or standard in determining this fitness; what makes this fitness? It is but another name for selfish prudence in the hand of the selfish utilitarian. It is the same thing with a changed name. With others there is a sort of æsthetic fitness or harmony. This is vague and has no force or authority with men, or has at least with but very few. It is vague, contradictory, powerless, and unsatisfactory. This standard of fitness is but a juggle of words.

Another standard is the greatest good of the greatest number. Here, again, the question arises, How do you decide whether a thing be good or not? Why is it good? What makes it good? Selfish utility? If so, you have only the first brutal, selfish standard with a changed name. If a sort of æsthetic fitness, or harmony, you have only the second vague, unauthoritative standard. All these attempted standards have no sanction, no authority, and have no principle that can be used as a standard. Reason and conscience are not satisfied with them. Conscience and man's spirituality reject selfish prudence as degrading and brutal. Reason rejects the rest as vague and unsatisfactory; and conscience finds in them no authority or sanction. Both reason and conscience feel after and grope around for a higher guide—a rock on which they can rest. What then shall

be our standard in deciding what is right and wrong, and what makes a thing right and the opposite wrong? To what shall we appeal to give authority and sanction to our decisions, and induce men to accept and obey them? How can we, in our instruction, supply to reason and conscience this needed guide—this rock on which they can rest?

Let us recur again to first principles. As we have shown, man is a religious being. His veneration and spirituality are the ruling and authoritative faculties of his nature. His religion decides for him what is right and wrong, and with sufficient authority to satisfy conscience and reason, and to give to its decisions adequate sanctions. Then when we are asked, what makes a thing right or wrong? how do you know that it is right or wrong? we reply, "Because an infinitely wise, just, good, and holy God has pronounced it to be right; and believing him to be infinite in wisdom, justice, goodness, and holiness, reason and conscience can accept with absolute confidence his decisions, and rest upon them with implicit and absolute satisfaction. His will is an absolute authority, and his rewards and punishments are adequate sanctions. Thus, we give to reason and conscience the guide after which they ever search—the rock for which they always grope when left to themselves. This accords with man's nature as a religious being; and with the fact that his religious nature is the regnant part of his being, and decides for him what is right and what is wrong. Nor do we entirely do away with other standards. As God is the author of man's rational nature, his law will ever agree with reason, when both are correctly interpreted and applied. God never requires man to do what violates reason, although he may ask him to believe things even though he can not understand how or why they are thus. Man does this in every domain of his thinking and action. Again, when we have a true standard of prudence, fitness, and philanthropy, it is the same as this standard of religion, or rather, God's will supplies the true and only standard of prudence and fitness, and it alone infallibly tells us what will secure the greatest good of the greatest number. It answers the questions, what is useful? what is fit? what will secure the greatest good of the greatest number? and lifts the answers into the domain of man's spiritual nature. They are good, fit, or useful, because in accordance with the will of an infinitely wise, just, good, and holy

God, who has an infinite and perfect knowledge of what is good, fit, or prudent, or useful, and has arranged all things in accordance with these great ideas ; so that as the apostle said concerning the Gospel and law, we do not make void, but establish these ideas.

Again, we meet the crucial question : How shall we learn what the will of God is ? How shall we decide what he has decreed ? Or to what shall we appeal in our moral instruction as the standard determining what God's will is concerning acts and ideas ? If we say, to nature, then we are thrown back on selfish prudence, fitness, or philanthropy, and we have neither standard, nor authority, nor sanction. We can only say that God's will sanctions such things because we learn from nature that they are useful, or fit, or for the greatest good, and we are thrown into all the confusion we have already exposed. Reason and conscience can not satisfy themselves in their search and attempts to settle these questions. Man can not reach the ideas of purity and holiness when unaided ; he can not give to his approximations authority and sanction. Then God must reveal himself, and his will and law. This revelation must be our standard ; to it we must appeal in our moral instruction, to decide what is right and what is wrong, or what is God's will. With this agrees the universal fact that legislators, moralists, and writers on jurisprudence, have always appealed to such revelations, or claimed their writings and laws to be such revelations ; and the equally well-established fact, that the idea and belief that they were such revelations, or were based on them, was necessary to secure obedience to them on the part of men. As the Bible contains the best embodiment of such professedly revealed decisions, it should be our standard. To the believer we say, as it is a revelation of such decisions, it should be our standard. As Christianity is the purest system of morality known to man, and has proper religious sanctions ; and as it has secured to us all we have achieved in our political, social, domestic, intellectual, and moral advancement, it should be our guide, and the New Testament our standard in our moral instruction. As a vast majority of our people believe it to be the only and a perfect revelation of God's will and law, it should be the standard in their schools. Its principles should be the principles of morality inculcated, and it should be our standard as to what God has revealed.

Now comes the question : "How shall the Bible be used in our

schools?" Merely as a book of devotion to be read to the pupils by the teacher, or, by the pupils and teacher conjointly, at morning exercises? Or, as a text-book of morality, requiring the pupils to learn its great principles of religion and morality? Or, shall it be merely a standard of reference in questions of morality, as a dictionary is in defining words? Shall it be read and made a text-book and the basis of regular lessons or general exercises? Some would have the teacher inculcate the great principles of morality and the great truths of religion on which they are based, as they are found in the Bible, without any reference to the Bible or appeal to it. This, as we have shown, would strip such morality of much of its power and sanction, by depriving it of the power imparted by the thought, it is a revelation from God of his will. Others would have the teacher appeal to the teachings of the Bible, but exclude the book itself. This substitutes memorizing by the teacher for a living contact of the pupil with the book. It is also liable to the objection that it introduces the teacher's bias without the counteracting and corrective influence of contact, on the part of the pupil, with the Bible. Perhaps an elementary book of morality based on the great religious and moral truths of the Bible, with the constant use of the Bible as a book of reference, would be the most practical.

Right here comes the objection that this opens the way to sectarianism. We deny that the Bible is sectarian. The great moral and religious truths of the Bible are not sectarianism. But will not the teacher's views color his instruction? Doubtless such will be the case. But do not a teacher's views color his instruction in history, geography, science of government, political economy, and physiology? We know such to be the case, and still we trust to the intelligence of the pupil to acquire the general truths of these sciences independent of the personal views of the teacher, and to form independent views of his own. We trust to the results of free investigation, and of contact with the truth, even though the views of the teacher may bias his instruction. Can not we do so in morals and the great religious truths on which it is based? Will not the pupil reach these great truths and rise superior to the bias of the teacher? What is feared is incidental to all instruction and human effort.

Before we yield to the present infidel and Roman Catholic clamor for the exclusion of the Bible, we had better stop and ask whither

we are tending, and where it will land us. First, we exclude the Protestant version to suit the Catholic; then the New Testament to suit the Jew; then the whole Bible to suit the Infidel; then all religious ideas or thought to suit the Atheist. Indeed, we have heard one eminent atheistic lecturer protest against his child's hearing even the idea of God, or immortality, or future rewards and punishments, or responsibility to any power above nature, as liable to fasten on him erroneous ideas and a degrading superstition. To carry out this idea, our entire literature would have to be expurgated, and even the singing, now so delightful a part of our public school exercises, would have to be stopped. Would not such schools be most bigotedly sectarian? Atheistically sectarian? In our attempts to avoid sectarianism and establish freedom of thought, we would run into the most intolerant and proscriptive sectarianism, and strangle all free thought. We have sometimes met with those who have objected to all allusions to the events of the late war in our text-books of history and geography, and who would not allow our national anthem, America, nor the Star-Spangled Banner to be sung in our public schools. We always say to such persons, we can not allow truth and patriotism to be so excluded from our schools. You have no business to have such prejudices; and we can no more yield to the demands of the infidel or Catholic than we can to those of the rebel.

Again, would such schools be neutral, as their advocates claim? Would not they be antagonistic to all religion and morality? Would not they be subversive of all fundamental morality? Could the State exist under such instruction? The French atheists, who tried the experiment, declared it could not. Can the State thus ignore the primal intuitions of our nature, when pretending to provide an efficient system of public instruction? Can we yield to every demand of depraved conscience? The polygamist might object to any thing that would tend to keep our youth out of his abominable practice. The desecrator of the Lord's-day might object to any teaching that would condemn his conduct. So also might the profane and obscene. Can we yield to the demands of every depraved conscience? Can we to those of the Catholic or infidel?

The general ideas of law, order, and morality must prevail over a depraved conscience; so must the course of action necessary to

secure them. The majority must rule in such cases, especially when their course is sanctioned by the primal intuitions of our nature, and every consideration of morality and public good. It is urged, sometimes, that parents can keep their children out of such exercises and away from their influence. While such a course would not be so intolerant and almost insolent, as the demand that all such instruction should be excluded from school, and denied even to those who wish to receive it; still, the question arises whether parents have a right to exclude such instruction from their children. If such instruction be needed to enable the State to accomplish its purposes in educating the youth and be demanded by public good, can it permit parents to exercise any such power, and to exclude such instruction from their children?

Then, we affirm that the use of the Bible as a standard of morality, and the inculcation of its morality and the great religious truths and principles that alone can give moral teaching authority and sanction, and make it effectual as a ruling power, is not sectarianism. It does not make a State Church, nor a State religious party. The severance between State and Church must not be so radical as to eliminate all religious ideas from the State and the system of instruction it provides for our youth. The State must legislate to have fundamental morality inculcated, and those great religious truths on which it must be based. The Church, as an organism, should be divorced from all connection with the State. Its rites, ceremonies, and sectarian dogmas should be excluded from our schools and our governmental action. But the fundamental morality and religion of Christianity the State must have. The State must have a conscience, and one based on and regulated by fundamental morality and religious sanction. It should have and use the best standard. Since God has revealed in Christianity a perfect system, the State should take such of its fundamental morality and religion as is needed to regulate its conscience and action, and take it as revealed and of divine authority, since the recognition of its being a divine revelation is necessary to its perfection as a standard. In secular instruction the State takes fundamental and general truths, and sees that correct ones are properly taught. So in moral instruction the State must take fundamental religion as necessary to moral instruction.



Whence, we ask, come all ideas of social order and justice, but from religion? They have always been directed, secured, and perpetuated by religious ideas and sanctions. Can the State secure them without using the influences that have given them existence? Right here we might call the attention of the reader to the destructive, disorganizing, agrarian, communistic character of those who are now engaged in this crusade. Of such persons we would ask: "Is there such a thing as fundamental morality—if so, what is its standard and sanction?" We affirm the State is based on fundamental morality, and the fundamental truths of religion its standard and sanction, They are its foundation, its life, its charter of authority.

All men and all States have religion in times of danger. We had during our Revolutionary struggle and during the late civil war, Plutarch and Lactantius tell us that all men and all States have religion in times of danger. It is not superstition, but the natural outworking of the primal intuitions inwrought into our being by its Creator. Men are then patriotic and heroic because God is on their side, and the issue is a moral issue—one in which they can invoke and expect his aid. The sublime declaration that "one with God on his side is a majority," will inspire men with more moral heroism than libraries of positivist twaddle about prudence and utility. Right is above all considerations of mere prudence and utility. States have been held responsible by God in his providence, and punished as nations. Then the State must have a conscience and morality, and this morality must be taught in school, and the conscience of the State must be formed aright by a proper molding of the conscience of its youth. The State must have a standard in doing this work, and must avail itself of, and must use the best—the true one. The State must avail itself of, and use the fundamental morality and religion of the Bible in fitting the citizen for the discharge of the duties of citizenship; and the majority can demand that what is essential to morality be taught in our schools. It is sometimes said that we should exclude Christianity as we do Mohammedanism, but we reply that we can not treat a true system as we do a false one, especially when it is so absolutely necessary to the State's object in educating the youth, that the State can not do without it. When the State demands that teachers have certificates before allowing them to teach, it provides that truth in science shall be taught and error excluded. In like



manner it must exclude error in morality, and secure the inculcation of truth. It virtually does this, and fully acknowledges its obligation to do so when it demands that each teacher shall have a good moral character. Hence, we can not treat a true system as we do a false one, or treat all systems alike, because they are not alike. One is true and absolutely essential to fundamental morality.

The action of the State in requiring or providing for an oath of office and testimony, for prayers, fasts, thanksgivings, chaplains, and Sunday laws and observances, is pursued either because the State recognizes Christianity as true and essential to it as a State, or because it considers that such recognition and deference is due to it as the religion of a majority of the people. Either reason would justify its use in our instruction as a standard of morality and fundamental religious ideas, and as a sanction. It is sometimes said that the State has no more to do with a system of religion than with the Copernican theory of the universe. We reply that in demanding that each teacher shall have a certificate before he can teach, the State provides for teaching the Copernican theory of the universe. It does require that fundamental truths of science be correctly taught in our schools. So it must require that the true system of morality and fundamental religious ideas on which alone it can be based, be taught. We recognize the truth of this when we require of the teacher a certificate of good moral character before we allow him to enter the school.

But we would respectfully ask of such liberal-minded persons as those who would treat all systems with equal indifference: "Does a man's religious ideas and belief affect the State no more than his belief or disbelief of the Copernican theory of the universe? Does that which determines the morality, the conduct and life of the people, affect the State no more than a scientific speculation?" Concerning what does the State legislate? On rights and wrongs, or morality, on the very matters decided by religion. It is a question to be carefully and thoughtfully weighed: Is a republican government possible except on a fundamentally moral and religious basis? The question is not so much whether the State, as such, shall have a religion, but whether it can afford to permit its people to be irreligious. The State, as such, must have fundamental morality and religion to regulate its action and conscience, and it can

not afford to permit its people to be irreligious, for to do so, would, as man is constituted, be to permit them to become immoral. The State is not a necessity to religion, and truth as much as religion is a necessity to the State. Nor can the State afford to trust to chance to make its people religious and moral. It must, as its first care, see that this result is secured by proper instruction, and sustained by a proper recognition of religion on its part.

We owe our political, social, domestic, intellectual, and moral pre-eminence to Christianity. If Christianity produced it, it is as necessary to perpetuate it, and to secure and maintain further progress. The State can not afford to trust to chance to have it exert this influence, and to have it furnish this fundamental religion and morality. The State educates to secure virtue and intelligence among its citizens. It can not, dare not, trust these vitally important qualifications to chance; it can not have morality without religion, fundamental religion. If such instruction be necessary to secure the public welfare, the depraved and perverted conscience of no man can stand in the way for one moment. We forbid polygamy, human sacrifices, and immoral religious rites as subversive of morality, regardless of the perverted consciences that believe in them. We demand the right to inspect convents regardless of the conscientious scruples of their supporters. We prevent the infliction of ecclesiastical punishment affecting person or property. We do all this regardless of the depraved conscience of any one, because demanded by the public good and fundamental morality. Catholics and nullifidians have the same rights as any other classes, but no more, and they must submit to the same restrictions, when demanded by the public good. If conscience will not permit them to do so, let them go where their conscience will not interfere with the public good. The utmost the State can do, is to permit the Catholic and nullifidian to keep their children out of the influence of religious instruction, such instruction as it must demand to secure fundamental morality. It can not, at their demand, exclude what is absolutely essential to secure the great end of instruction. Indeed, it is very questionable whether it can even permit such an exercise of perverted conscience, as that of which we have spoken. If it be necessary to public good that their children receive this instruction, and if the State owes to their children the duty of seeing that they enjoy such instruction, it can and should

refuse to allow them to injure their children and the State in any such exercise of perverted conscience.

The State does interfere with parental ideas, to secure health, intelligence, and morality; and if securing religious and moral instruction to all children be demanded by any of these considerations, it can interfere again with parental ideas. This pretended liberty of the nullifidian is intolerantly sectarian, bigotedly sectarian. We would have a most intolerantly proscriptive, atheistic course of instruction. We can not, as we regard morality and social order, or even national life, permit any such atheistic government or instruction. We must have in governmental action, in the constitution of government, and in the very constitution of marriage, family, society, and school, and in the establishment and regulation of these, by government, the fundamental basis-ideas of an infinitely wise, holy, powerful, and just God, as the Creator and Ruler of the universe—his will as our standard of right—our accountability to him, and his rewards and punishments, both in this life and the world to come, as sanctions to our systems of morality and our systems of moral precepts. As man is constituted, we can not have government or instruction without these ideas. We can not ignore the primal intuitions of our nature in marriage, family, society, government, and school. To all who think we can, we say: "Decide first these fundamental queries: Is man a religious being, or is he an atheistic being?" If man be an atheistic being, then atheistic instruction and government is right. If he is a religious being; if government and schools ignore the great primal intuitions of his nature, they will be engines of destruction of government, society, marriage, family, school, and all morality. In conclusion, let me urge on all lovers of humanity, all friends of order and progress, that they awake to the crisis that superstition and irreligion are now forcing on us, and that they study anew these fundamental truths, and thus stem with argument and action the incoming flood of irreligion and ruin.

## II.—THE PERVERSION OF FAITH.

### A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE TEACHINGS OF SCHOOLMEN TOUCHING THE NATURE, SOURCE, INFLUENCE, AND EFFECT OF FAITH.

IN a former number of the *QUARTERLY*, a writer presented certain views concerning Faith which must, without any question, come in collision with the popular theory on that subject, and which, he well knows, will meet with opposition from an overwhelming majority of pulpit orators, religious editors, and critics throughout the land. Conscious of good intentions, and satisfied of the correctness of these views—the matured deliberations of a quarter of a century—the present writer proposes to continue the investigation, and present a paper, as a sequel to the essay on the "*Relation of Faith and Salvation*." He proposes to strengthen the argument for "*Intellectualism*" by reviewing the opinions of the defenders of "*Mysticism*."

In order to set the two systems in opposition, we condense from the article referred to the leading features of the two conflicting theories, and place them side by side, so that the reader may see the difference at a glance.

#### MYSTICISM

Is the doctrine of direct or immediate spiritual influence; assuming that man by birth, nature, and habit is totally depraved—so depraved that he is utterly unable to use any intellectual or moral power for his conversion, until God enables him to do so by direct influence—and this direct influence results in *Regeneration*. The mind being thus illuminated, the moral sensibilities being aroused, and the will impelled, man exercises faith in God and Christ—believes the truth to the saving of his soul.

Mysticism declares that man is passive, and publishes to the world that passivity is orthodoxy, activity is heterodoxy.

It conceives that the grace of God is

#### INTELLECTUALISM

Is the doctrine of mediate Spiritual influence; contending that man, by birth and nature, is not totally depraved, but may become so by habit. It defends the apostolic thesis, "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." It humbly acknowledges its inability to devise a plan of salvation, but rejoices in the moral ability possessed by the mind to accept the plan of Christ. It sits with Mary at the Master's feet, and learns wisdom from his lips. It communes with Peter as he discourses to the Jews on Pentecost; with Paul as he reasons concerning the Christ at Thessalonica. It will not consent to be passive, but thinks, feels, and wills as God, by his Spirit in the apostles, gives direction. It con-

a mystic divine influence moving upon the spirit of man, and exciting him to action; that just as God breathed upon the automatic Adam in Eden, and the lifeless red earth became a living soul, so God breathes upon the automatic sinner, and he becomes a living soul in Christ, and then believes in the Son of God.

ceives that the grace of God has appeared unto all men in the proclamation of the Gospel; that the Gospel is the grace of God—and the only grace—that it is the power, and the only power, of God unto salvation. It is reason *hearing* God, *believing* God, invoking the affections to love God, invoking the will to obey God.

The one declares that all inspired Scripture is not sufficiently profitable for doctrine so as to lead man in the way of life; the other declares that all inspired Scripture is so completely profitable for doctrine that it is capable of making a man wise unto salvation. The one boldly affirms that the Word of God is an *assemblage of dead types*;\* the other contends that "the Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, . . . and is a *discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart*," simply republishing, in these modern times, the clear declaration of Paul, made some eighteen centuries ago.

But we must proceed to our review.

The perversion of faith commenced at an early period. The system of divine truth styled Christianity is marked throughout the Word of God by divine unity. It is the beauty of holiness, the sublimity of thought, the compassion of feeling, and the majesty of law. All the parts are factors; all the principles are "parts of one stupendous whole." The whole was made for man—fallen man—intellectual man—a moral agent—a responsible being. Christianity is man added to revelation; man believing, obeying, worshipping God.

How can man worship God unless he believe in God? How can he believe in God unless he hear God? How can he hear God without a preacher? How can one preach unless he be sent? How can he be sent unless by the authority of Christ? There, my unsettled reader, is the question for you to examine. Suffer me to suggest that you will fall back to the first century, and let the ear of your mind hear the preachers whom Christ sent—the *apostles*; the only infallible preachers that ever spoke on earth after the ascension of the Lord of glory to heaven. Soon after the death of the apostles

\* The writer heard this expression from the Rev. Dr. Stiles, in Georgetown, Kentucky, twenty-five or thirty years ago, and he believes that the Presbyterian Church indorses the sentiment.

"grievous wolves entered in among the disciples; men arose speaking perverse things, drawing away disciples after them; perverting the Gospel of Christ," and removing the mind from the simplicity of the truth to the jargon of vain and foolish philosophy. The whole system of Christianity was, in the course of time, perverted, and amid the wreck, made by men, of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, *faith* shared the common fate. Apostolic intellectualism gave way to patristic mysticism, and the latter, in the course of ages, moved side by side with deistic fideism, and the two combined have given aid to antichrist in impeding the progress of Christianity.

All the errors of Protestant theology have sprung from the Man of Sin, the autocrat of "Christendom," (?) who, for more than fifteen centuries past, has been dictating doctrine, discipline, and government to the religious world; usurping authority unknown to the apostles; acquiring and wielding power over the hearts and consciences of men, subversive of moral liberty; asserting prerogatives incompatible with the Divine constitution, and demoralizing humanity more than the sensualism of the Mohammedan or the skepticism of the deist. This mighty power proposes to divest man of intellect, and compel him to speak, write, and act as it may direct. And in order to carry out its wicked purpose of subjugation it boldly asserts the utter incapacity of the mind to comprehend the simple truths of the Gospel, to believe those truths, or obey its commands. It reserves the right of construction, dictation, and legislation. The great truth, running throughout the whole Bible, and finding response in the mental constitution of man, that *faith is the belief of a proposition sustained by evidence*, is denied by the Papacy, and this denial has been supported by a large majority of Protestant doctors.

The theory of utter inability to hear that the soul may live was never presented by an inspired apostle. It was reserved for the revolutionary fathers of the early ages of the Church to inaugurate the heresy. To Augustine belongs the chief honor (?) of its introduction. He gave it to the Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church gave it to the religious world. Most of the distinguished writers, Papal and Protestant, whose works have been handed down to us, have copied from one another. They all begin with the anti-scriptural dogma that man is so depraved that God, by his direct power, must regenerate him, in order that he may subsequently give him the grace



of faith. Of course, in elaborating their systems of divinity they are compelled to be consistent, and to treat man as the artist treats a block of marble—dead limestone, which, by cutting and carving, he works into a living form. They contemplate God only as a Creator, and utterly forget that he is a Lawgiver. They view the soul of man as a complete chaos, insensate rock, not possessing even vegetative sensation. A human being, in their estimation, is a mere conglomerate of human body and demon spirit; that he is from his birth a compound of evil things not unlike the poisonous mixture in the witches' cauldron.

“Wool of bat, and tongue of dog,  
Adder's fork, and blind worm's sting,  
Lizard's leg, and owlet's wing;  
Liver of blaspheming Jew,  
Gall of goat, and slips of yew.”

Out of such a mass of corruption it would be hard, very hard, we acknowledge, to make a Christian. It would be exceedingly difficult indeed to *make* such a being believe any thing. How impossible, then, to induce him to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God! If the premises of the Augustine theology be correct, then the reasoning and the conclusion are correct, and we are found false witnesses; for we have said that “faith comes by hearing,” while Augustine and all his followers, Papal and Protestant, declare that it comes by infusion—divine coercion. We have said that it is the active movement of an intelligent moral agent; they say that it is a grace imparted to a passive soul incapable of excitement by motives. We have learned from the divine oracles that God affords testimony in abundance concerning his Son to induce men to believe in him; they have no use for such testimony, and refer the exercise of faith wholly to omnipotent power. We have learned from the same source that faith purifies the heart; they insist that the heart must first be purified by immediate spiritual influence before faith can be evolved. We have learned that faith is the initiative movement in regeneration, an elementary constituent; they declare that regeneration precedes faith. Our whole course of thinking and reasoning on this subject, drawn from the Scriptures, is in direct opposition to the prevailing opinions and sentiments of the vast majority of theologians of the past fifteen centuries. But we care not for human majorities. Put all the “Christian fathers,” all the popes, cardinals, archbishops, bish-

ops, and priests of Rome, then crowd in all the Anglican doctors, all the American in one scale, and let the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit press the other, and the huge mass of humanity will rise and kick the beam.

But it is time to present to the reader a few passages from these uninspired teachers, who have been engaged in the work of perversion. Our first quotation shall be taken from a volume entitled, "*One Hundred Short Sermons*. By H. J. Thomas, Canon of the Cathedral of Liege, Belgium. Translated from the French by Rev. G. A. Hamilton. With an introduction by M. J. Spalding, D. D., formerly Bishop of Louisville, now Archbishop of Baltimore." The work purports to be a series of sermons on the *Apostles' Creed*, the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Angelic Salutation*, the *Commandments of God*, the *Precepts of the Church*, the *Seven Sacraments*, and the *Seven Deadly Sins*. In the discourse on faith, the author propounds the question, What is faith? Thus he answers:

"Faith is a gift of God, and a supernatural virtue, by which we firmly believe in God and all the truths which the Church teaches, because God, who reveals them, is truth itself. I proceed, my brethren, to explain, first, faith is a gift of God and a supernatural virtue. It comes not from ourselves; it is not our production. We can never have it in our hearts except through an effect of God's goodness and liberality. It is supernatural; we can not acquire it by the exercise of our intellectual or moral powers; it can come only direct from heaven; for the Scripture saith, 'by grace are ye saved through faith,' and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. How happy are all who have received this gift! . . . . The very day in which you became Christians, and received the gift of faith at the baptismal font, there were millions of children born throughout the whole extent of the world, who had not the same happiness you had. They were born in barbarous and idolatrous countries. Why were not you born in those countries? 'O, Virgin of Israel,' saith the Lord, 'I have loved thee with an eternal love. I have raised thee up even unto myself.' . . . In the second place, faith is the gift of God and a supernatural virtue by which we believe *firmly*. When a Catholic says 'I believe,' he virtually says 'I am sure there is nothing but truth in every thing which the Church of Jesus Christ proposes to my belief, and I believe the Word of God more than the testimony of my own eyes or the judgment of my own reason.' All the dogmas of the Holy Apostolic Catholic Church are all equally true, and when propounded to us we ought to believe them firmly without doubting."

Such are the enunciations of a distinguished doctor of the Romish Church, and they are indorsed by the Archbishop of Baltimore. Ay, they are received by millions of credulous beings throughout the civilized world, and among these credulous persons are some of the most learned men in the world. Behold the spectacle! Look

over the world of mind and see the stupefying influence exercised over human beings by the sorceries of the Man of Sin! The absurd philosophy set forth in the declarations of Canon Thomas, has ruled the religious world for nearly fifteen centuries. The disturbing forces which arrested the progress of pure and undefiled religion "in the early ages of the Church," and substituted the doctrines and commandments of men, destroyed the harmony of the Christian system as it came from Christ and the apostles, and gave to the world senseless mummery, irrational jargon, and pagan rite. If there be a single principle of Christianity which Rome has not perverted we do not know what that principle is. Does Christianity teach that the bread and the wine in the Lord's-Supper are the simple emblems of the broken body and shed blood of the Redeemer? Rome teaches "that the bread and the wine in this institution are converted into the body and blood of Christ, and she has made myriads of credulous souls accept the absurdity. Does Christianity teach that baptism is the immersion of a penitent believer in water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, followed by remission of sins? Rome teaches that baptism is the sprinkling of water in the name of the Trinity upon infant or adult, in ninety cases out of a hundred, upon a sleeping babe, accompanied with regenerating grace, and the barbaric invention has been copied, with some modification, by a large and respectable portion of the religious world. Does Christianity teach that faith is the belief of the truth, and that the testimony of the apostles has been written and handed down to establish this truth? Rome teaches that faith is a grace, a supernatural virtue, something injected into the mind by Omnipotence, and an overwhelming majority of Protestant teachers take up the falsehood and republish it all over "Protestant Christendom." How the wicked usurper in the temple of God must laugh, and say in his heart, "Aha, these Protestants are plagiarists; they steal my doctrine, preach it from their pulpits, and then abuse me! How ungrateful they are!" The teaching of this author on the subject of faith is very remarkable. It is remarkable that any man endowed with intellect could utter such absurdities, and it is just as remarkable that any man of sense could believe them. The grace of faith imparted to a sleeping babe at the moment the sacramental hands apply oil and spittle, and the lips of the administrator pronounce the falsehood, "I baptize thee!" Can

Dahomey, or the gold coast of Africa, or any of the Polynesian islands produce any thing more superstitious? Did ever maniac in an asylum assert any thing more outrageously ridiculous than that a babe at baptism, incapable of reasoning, receives the gift of faith, *whereby it firmly believes in God and the truths of the Catholic Church?* Does Canon Thomas, of Belgium, himself believe it? If he does he is demented. If he does not he is simply preaching the absurdities of Romanism, carrying in his bosom a heart incapable of loving God and reverencing his Word.

The difference between a babe and a man, as to faith, is, according to Thomas, of Belgium, simply this: A babe has no reason, and yet believes firmly in God at the baptismal font. A man has reason in great abundance, but it must be set aside in order that he may believe. And thus is fulfilled, according to Thomas, that Scripture, "Ye must become as little children before ye can be converted." Perhaps we have not quoted it exactly right, but at all events it will suit the priest.

Again: "Let him become a fool that he may be wise," is a scrap that might be brought into requisition to sustain this philosophy of faith; and a sermon preached by the ingenious, if not ingenuous, Canon on this short text, "We are fools," 1 Cor. iv, 10, would lead many an inquiring soul to pray God to stupefy his mind in order that he might receive "the grace of faith." In treating the subject, however, he would be compelled to reject as spurious the passage in John xx, 31, "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." It would require a little too much reading to examine the things written in order to faith to suit the holy apostolic Catholic Church. She proposes to dispense with intellect altogether, and make man the quiet, unresisting, credulous babe, imbibing faith from God as a sponge imbibes water, as radicles imbibe moisture. The whole thing is capillary attraction, a mere physical phenomenon, Omnipotence impelling brute matter, Omnipotence impelling brute mind.

But we are strongly impressed with the idea that the Canon and his Church are both wrong, and that John was right when he said, "These are written that ye might believe;" that Paul was right when he said that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of

God ;" and that Peter was right when he said that "God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the Word of the Gospel, and believe, and put no difference between us and them (Jews and Gentiles), purifying their hearts by faith ;" that Paul was right again when, on the occasion of preaching the Gospel in his own hired house in Rome, and some "believed the things that were spoken, and some believed not," he expounded the whole matter by saying, in the language of Isaiah, "Hearing, ye shall hear and not understand ; and seeing, ye shall see and not perceive ; for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and *their eyes have they closed ; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their hearts, and should be converted* (or should turn, active voice) and I should heal them."

The teaching of Canon Thomas, of Belgium, is the teaching of all the Catholic Doctors from St. Augustine to Bishop Spalding, a period of fourteen hundred and fifty years. It is simply a perversion of all truth, a contradiction of the Holy Spirit, a bold dispute with the Almighty, a denial of Christ, a part and parcel of that unholy *mystery*, that hideous *blasphemy*, which was to characterize the movements of the grand iniquity of the earth. How mortifying to Christian pride it is that reformers, most of them, from Luther to Spurgeon, have adopted the heresy! To their writings we appeal in support of this declaration.

We begin our quotations with a passage from the prime advocate of Protestantism.

#### MARTIN LUTHER'S CONCEPTION OF FAITH.

We honor the great Reformer, but we can adopt neither his notion of consubstantiation nor his notion of faith. We are compelled to rank him in the school of the mystics. In his sermon entitled "The Method and Fruits of Justification," he says :

"Faith alone makes us sons of God. It is the word of grace followed by the Holy Ghost, as is shown in many places ; for example, where we read of the Holy Ghost falling on Cornelius and his family while hearing the preaching of Peter. It is faith that justifies thee, thou being endued therewith by the Spirit, which changes the man, makes him anew, and gives him another reason and another will."

The same mystical philosophy which had prevailed in the Catholic Church for so many dark ages, and which made a deep, yea, an

ineradicable impression on all of her doctors, clouded the mind of the Protestant teacher. With all his earnest, powerful, and courageous opposition to the errors of Rome, he retained at least these two—mystical presence in the Eucharist, and mystical faith in the sinner's heart proceeding from a renewal, wrought by supernatural, hypermoral, extra-scriptural influence. The theory of Luther was adopted by all the German and French Reformers.

We pass over from the Continent to the British Isles, and, for a moment, look at the Scotch Theology.

#### ERSKINE'S VIEW OF FAITH.

Ralph Erskine was one of the great lights of the Scotch pulpit, and may be contemplated as a representative man. His view of faith may be gathered from the following passages taken from a discourse delivered in 1725, from the text: "And unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Gen. xlix, 10.

"In this gathering unto Shiloh the soul acts *believingly*. There is a spiritual internal principle from which the man acts, even the Spirit of God as the main, and the new heart as the subordinate principle of faith in the man. The Spirit's inhabitation may be known by the actings of the graces of the Spirit, such as *faith*, love, repentance, joy, and the like. *There is no gathering to him without a draft of Omnipotency. 'Draw me.'* There is the Almighty, irresistible, direct power. '*We will run.*' There is the voluntary motion of the soul. The flight of faith is quick, quick as lightning. When the soul is on the wing, under the influence of the spirit of faith, it can flee from earth to heaven in a moment."

This opinion of faith is sustained by John Knox, John M'Laurin, Robert Walker, Thomas Chalmers, Edward Irving, and the whole body of Scotch ministers; by Wickliffe, Chillingworth, Baxter, Bunyan, Tillotson, Barrow, of England, and by Jeremy Taylor and Carson, of Ireland.

Crossing the Atlantic in our survey, we will contemplate THE AMERICAN PULPIT.

#### THEORY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS.

Among the distinguished defenders of passivity, instantaneous regeneration by direct spiritual influence preceding faith, stands the great American metaphysician, Jonathan Edwards. His name is a tower of strength in the defense of the Augustinian-Calvinistic doctrine; and all his utterances are regarded by the Old-School Presby-



terian body as the expression of orthodoxy. In his work on the Affections, he says :

"The Scriptural representations of conversion strongly imply and signify a change of nature, such as being born again, becoming new creatures, rising from the dead, being renewed in the spirit of the mind, dying to sin, and living to righteousness, putting off the old man and putting on the new man, having a divine seed implanted in the heart, being made partakers of the divine nature, etc. God gives his Spirit (to the sinner) to be united to the faculties of the soul, and to dwell there as a principle of spiritual life and activity. He not only actuates the soul, but he abides in it. The mind thus endued with grace (direct from God) is possessed of a new nature, and is then made capable of believing in Christ."

#### PRINCETON DIVINITY.

Dr. James Wood, of Princeton, and with him agree Dr. Hodge and Dr. Alexander of the same school, thus sustains Dr. Edwards:

"That the soul is passive in regeneration is the doctrine of our standards, and it necessarily results from the preceding view concerning the nature of the change. In the chapter on effectual calling, both are presented in connection with each other. The change itself is declared to consist in enlightening the minds spiritually and savingly, to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them a heart of flesh, renewing their wills, etc. It is then added, that 'this effectual call is of God's free (direct) and special grace alone, not from any thing foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it. Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them; . . . not by imputing faith itself, but by imputing the obedience of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God. And this faith is the alone instrument of justification."

Here then is the order according to the Augustinian-Calvinistic code: 1. Pre-Adamite election. 2. Predestination to eternal life. 3. Effectual calling. 4. Regeneration. 5. Repentance. 6. Faith. 7. Justification. 8. Adoption. 9. Sanctification. 10. Eternal Salvation.

#### DANVILLE DIVINITY.

##### DR. BRECKENRIDGE'S NINE POINTS.

1. "Man, created in the image of God, lost that image by sinning against God, and must be restored to it, or remain forever unfit for communion with God, averse to it, and excluded from it.

2. "In regeneration fallen man is restored to the lost image of God by the divine renovation of his depraved nature.

3. "The human nature, which is thus created anew, is the same human nature

which fell; the change which takes place therein being wholly spiritual as to its kind, and wholly of the person in whom it occurs.

4. "This change is the result of a work of infinite grace and almighty power, in which the Holy Spirit is the sole efficient agent.

5. "The efficient instrumentality whereby this change is wrought is the Truth of God, made effectual by the Spirit of God, the change wrought being in man and not in the truth, nor in God.

6. "It is in Christ Jesus, Immanuel, the Mediator, that the whole takes place; in consequence of his work, on account of his merits, for his sake, by his Spirit, unto his life, that man is born again.

7. "It is after God that our nature is restored; God himself is the divine model of the new creation; created originally in his likeness, we are really and spiritually restored thereto in our new birth.

8. "*In this work of Divine renovation man is wholly passive*; but this passivity is peculiar, namely, that of a living soul which incurs a vital, spiritual restoration, wrought in a manner wholly regardful of its own absolute essence.

9. "It is, therefore, an act of God, a sovereign act of the Creator, wherein these sinful persons of the human race, who will inherit eternal life, are renewed in the image of God." (Knowledge of God, Vol. II, pp. 156, 157.)

This statement made by Dr. B., is called by the author "a sublime concatenation of revealed truth." Strange, indeed, that two or three words should mar the beauty of a divine system. Substitute for "*passive*" in the eighth point the word *active*, and for "*passivity*," *activity*, and we have very little objection to the propositions; but those words ruin the whole thing, making man a very inferior animal and God an unprincipled tyrant, destroying the Gospel in all its moral bearings, erasing every attribute of Jehovah, and rendering the system of redemption a curious congeries of mysticism, coercion, and fatalism.

In harmony with this theory of spiritual renovation, we find the learned Presbyterian Doctor teaches extra-scriptural and wholly super-rational views concerning faith. Let us hear him.

#### BRECKENRIDGE ON FAITH.

"Now at every stage of the progress of this wonderful transformation of man from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, means exist of ascertaining the reality of the progress, and of distinguishing the stage reached. Vital manifestations continually occur. The earliest, the most constant, and the most decisive of them all, is faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. Every act of faith is an act of the new creature, man born again. Throughout the universe every created thing, animate and inanimate, physical and spiritual, is endowed with qualities peculiar to its own nature, and acts by laws impressed upon that particular nature by the creative power of God. Now he who is born again is as really a creature of God as any thing else in the universe, and upon a most obvious scale of classifica-

tion, it is as exact to say that faith is the characteristic mark of the new creature as that reason is of the natural man, or that instinct is of the brute creation. Faith is proof positive that man (himself being passive) has been born of God (by the direct influence of the Spirit). We have been created anew in Christ Jesus, therefore saving faith manifests itself in us." (Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 257.)

The following extract shows very clearly that the Doctor accepts the Papal doctrine of infantile faith:

"I am not able to perceive in the actual state of knowledge attainable by us concerning our earliest mental and spiritual exercises, upon what ground it is that we can question the applicability to an infant soul, of any part of that glorious work which is allowed to be applicable to an adult. Being a fallen soul, why may not the work of the Spirit be effectual in it; and why may it not be united to Christ and have communion with him in grace as well as in glory? To say that it can not believe in Christ is to say far more than we know; and besides, if this were true, what would follow would be that there must be more than one way of salvation, or infants can not be saved at all."

The distinguished Doctor is so confident of the truth of his nine points, and the corollaries drawn from them touching faith, yea, faith exercised by the infant in the cradle, that he says very boldly, "that any representation of a spiritual renovation of man," including the infant, "essentially variant from this, is inconsistent with human nature, contradictory of human experience, and irreconcilable with the spiritual system of the universe."

STEPHEN OLIN.

DR. OLIN may be regarded as one of the ablest ministers of the Methodist Church. He is represented by his reviewers as the Chalmers of the Methodist Church. An able writer in the *Quarterly Review* says of him: "In overmastering power in the pulpit, we doubt whether living he had a rival, or dying has left his like among men." In a discourse on "*Faith in Christ, the Great Want of the Soul*," from the text, "Ye believe in God; believe also in me," John xiv, 1, he says:

"Now the great proofs on which the Gospel relies, are demonstrations made to the moral perceptions of man, and are altogether independent of logic and metaphysics. Even the preliminary evidences and influences of the Gospel are of this sort. The true light shines into all hearts directly from God. The Spirit operates divinely upon all, and all have a witness within that responds to the Gospel message."

It is scarcely necessary to say that Dr. Olin is sustained in this view of faith by all the bishops and deacons of the Methodist Epis-

copal Church in the United States, and that the practice of the denomination in all their revivals, of praying for the descent of the Holy Spirit to enlighten the mind and give faith to the sinner, is in strict accordance with their theory.

#### VIEW OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH.

THE theory of the Baptist denomination touching faith, repentance, etc., may be gathered from her Articles of Faith, published two hundred years ago, in London, or from the Confession of Faith, formally prepared by I. N. Brown, D. D., and adopted by the American Baptists some years ago. From the latter we extract portions of the seventh and eighth articles.

"We believe that in order to be saved sinners must be regenerated; that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind; that it is effected in a manner above our comprehension, by the power of the Holy Spirit, in connection with divine truth; that repentance and faith are inseparable graces wrought in our souls by the regenerating Spirit of God."

In a word, copying the old patristic theology, our Baptist friends have given to the world the opinion that regeneration precedes faith, and that it is the result of a direct, quick, powerful, irresistible movement of Omnipotence on a passive mind, and that man is simply entitled to the privilege of sitting still, and waiting till God moves on him, and makes him willing and ready to believe the Gospel. We regret that a people who have done so much for the restoration of the Gospel should still be aiding in the perversion of faith.

In the midst of all this mysticism, beginning with Tertullian and coming on down in "regular succession" through Augustine, the Catholic Confederacy, the German, French, Scotch, English, and American pulpit, it is refreshing to observe that there are some noble souls who, rising superior to human formulas, have stood up for the Word of God, and, in spite of their systems, *protested*, by their labors, not only against the superadded sacraments of Papacy, image worship, and ritualism in general, but against that speculative philosophy which teaches that man is the passive recipient of an inflowing grace, proceeding directly from God, and impelling the soul, "*being MADE willing*" to the exercise of faith in Christ. We express it as our deep conviction that one of the most outrageous errors of Papacy is her philosophy of faith; that this philosophy of faith has

been received without any essential emendation by nine-tenths of the Protestant world, and, still further, that the moral power of Protestantism against Popery can never exert any effective influence until Protestants consent to restore the apostolic principle that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." This glorious truth has been almost expunged from the creeds of councils, the confessions of assemblies, the deliverances of synods, and the articles of conventions. Men, instead of meeting God manifested in the flesh in the person of Christ, have been attempting to scale the heights of glory; to ascend up into heaven to bring the Spirit of Christ down; to urge God to manifest more power in addition to that of the Gospel, thus virtually denying that the "Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."

Shall we hear the testimony of a few of these witnesses?

ROBERT SOUTH, one of the ornaments of the Church of England, in a discourse on "*The Image of God in Man*," delivered at the cathedral of St. Paul, in 1662, says, in conclusion,

"The difference between man innocent and man fallen is very great. He is, as it were, a new kind of species; the plague of sin has altered his very nature, and eaten into his very vitals. The image of God is wiped out; the creatures have shaken off his yoke, renounced his sovereignty, and revolted from his dominion. The Christian religion is the great and only means that God has sanctified and designed to repair the breaches of humanity; to set fallen man upon his legs again; to *clarify his reason, rectify his will*, and to compose and regulate his affections. The recovery of this lost image, as it is God's pleasure to command, and *our duty to endeavor*, so it is in his power only to effect. To whom be praise, might, majesty, and dominion, both now and forever more. Amen."

BENJAMIN KEACH, the great Baptist preacher in London for thirty-six years, and who suffered imprisonment in the reign of Charles the Second, seems to have had a most exalted conception of the power of the Gospel upon the heart of man. In his sermon on "*The Scriptures Superior to all Spiritual Manifestations*," we find the following passages:

"That Word, that is more sure than the voice which came from the excellent glory in the holy mount, must be of the greatest authority and most powerful efficacy to believe and repent. But the Holy Scripture is a more sure word, therefore it is of the greatest authority; ay, it is to be preferred above that glorious voice heard in the mount.

"If the Holy Scriptures are every way sufficient in respect of faith, practice, and salvation, then the Holy Scriptures have the only efficacy in them for this great end. That this is so, see what Paul says to Timothy—'All Scriptures given by

inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine,' etc. 'God hath magnified his Word above his name.' Now what way of revelation of God to his creatures hath God magnified as he hath his written Word, as above all manifesting God's name, by which he is made known. Let us learn from hence to bless God that he hath afforded us the best and most effectual means to believe in him, and to turn our souls from evil ways, that we may be eternally saved."

JOHN GODFREY VON HERDER, one of Germany's most learned and pious men, and who did more than any man of his times to form the national taste of the great central empire, manifested in his labors of thought and love, an exalted estimate of God's Word to arouse man to faith and obedience. From a sermon on "*The Divinity and Right use of the Bible*," preached in 1769, we make a few extracts:

"It were foolish to expect that the Spirit of God would work in us without the exercise of our own activity; foolish to expect that good thoughts will work in us without our thinking the same. Any such expectation of the divine aid in the use of God's Word annuls the use of reason, and is itself absurd and anomalous. Nothing can work in a rational soul except through means, on the ground of reason, and by means of motives, and I must, that moment, be able to annihilate the substance of my soul if I should expect that God would insert, in the course of my own thoughts, his own intervening thoughts, and so, while I remained passive, transform me into something better than I am.

"God has seen fit to let us have a clear and definite voice, which shall teach us what he is and what we are; indicate our relations to him, exhort us to all good, make us acquainted with ourselves, and teach us the immortality of the soul. The Deity has taken an interest in us under his own gracious inspection and guidance. He has instituted for us the rule of faith and practice, and lo! this is our Bible! It is yet more than this. I am a fallen creature in the sight of my God. I am a sinner. How shall I comfort myself? Upon what conditions will God pardon, and upon what terms can I become reconciled to him, and walk before him in peace? Ah! here all is silent—reason, creation, conscience, conjecture, world-wisdom! O, God! couldst thou then have left me? couldst thou have left the human race in this wicked uncertainty? Compassionate Being! Shouldst thou not have had pity upon thy creature, and through a *positive revelation*, declared to him thy will, and given him consolation, and shown to him the way of atonement, and the means of being assured of thy grace! Lo! this is our Bible! It is yet more. I have not in myself strength sufficient to transform my whole nature. How then, O gracious God! shall I not hope from thee, and expect that thou, *through a definite revelation, shouldst animate my heart*, unlock the riddle of my destiny, establish my immortality, and make me firm and faithful in virtue and tranquillity of mind? *And lo! this does the Bible!*"

JOHN M'LAURIN, "one of the brightest ornaments" of the Scotch pulpit, in his discourse on "*Glorying in the Cross of Christ*," delivered in Glasgow more than a hundred years ago, gave utterance to some of the noblest thought and sentiments that ever fell from the lips of



man. He forgot his Calvinism, and preached Christ. Let us read a few passages.

"Divine glory shone indeed there in a bright manner in that face on the mount of transfiguration, but not so brightly as on Mount Calvary. This was the more glorious transfiguration of the two, and here we may behold the glory of the Lord. Here shines spotless justice, incomprehensible wisdom, and infinite love at once. They mingle their beams, and shine with eternal splendor—the Just Judge, the Merciful Father, and the Wise Governor. Its glory produces powerful effects wherever it shines. It melts cold and frozen hearts; it breaks stony hearts; it pierces adamant; it penetrates thick darkness. How justly it is called marvelous light! It gives eyes to the blind and to the dead. It is the light of life. Its energy is beyond the force of thunder, and it is more mild than the dew on the tender grass. Such is the power of the cross—Christ crucified—the sufferings of Jesus in death to save rebellious man."

THOMAS CHALMERS, the grand orator, moralist, and metaphysician, one of the brightest stars in the Scotch galaxy, has left us a record of his heart and his head, and like M'Laurin, abandons his cold Augustinism, and chimes in with Paul in asserting and maintaining the thesis that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. From his discourse on "*The Expulsive Power of a New Affection*," we make a few quotations.

"The way to dispossess the heart of an old affection is by the expulsive power of a new one. The Gospel, which dictates so mighty an obedience, places within our reach as mighty an instrument of obedience. It brings to the door of our heart an affection, which, once seated upon its throne, will either subordinate every previous inmate or bid it away. It places before the eye of the mind God, so that in beholding him we may love him. It is there, and there only, that God stands revealed as an object of faith to sinners. It is God apprehended by the believer as God in Christ, who alone can dispossess the world from its ascendancy. When we are enabled by faith to see his glory in the face of Jesus Christ, and to hear his voice protesting good-will to men, it is then that a love paramount to the love of the world, and at length expulsive of it, first arises in the regenerating heart. Hence we may see what it is that makes the most effective kind of preaching. Let a preacher be a faithful expounder of the Gospel testimony, and he has a truth in possession which, into whatever heart it enters, will, like the rod of Aaron, swallow up all the serpents of evil coiled therein. He exerts an influence under which the leading tastes and tendencies of the old man are destroyed, and he becomes a new creature in Jesus our Lord. Let us then insist on the claims of Jesus to your affection. Naught but faith and understanding are wanting on your part to call forth the love of your hearts.

"Unbelievers can not get rid of their old affections because they keep themselves out of sight from all those truths which have influence to raise a new one. The object of the Gospel is to pacify the sinner's conscience, and to purify his heart. The best way of casting out an impure affection is to admit a pure one, and by the love of what is good to expel the love of what is evil."

Noble Chalmers! When your heart was warm with a sense of the love of God in Christ, you imbibed the spirit of Paul, ay, of the Master himself, and receiving this spirit in your heart, its "expulsive power" drove out the old affection for Augustine and Calvin. Let Christ dwell in the heart by faith, and all human philosophy contrary to Christ will be expelled.

We close our quotations in vindication of the true philosophy of faith by making a liberal draught from a work entitled "*Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation*," originally published thirty years ago in Cincinnati, revised and republished in this country and in Europe, with the approbation of leading men of all religious parties.

"Before, therefore, we endeavor to show the adaptedness of the Christian Scriptures as the *only system of truth*, by which man's moral nature can be rightly and fully developed, let us notice, in connection, some of the views by which we have argued the necessity of an objective revelation of divine truth, in opposition to the false notion that a knowledge of the divine character and of human duty are revealed subjectively in the soul.

"Man is created conscious of imperfection and capable of culture. Man can receive moral culture only by the aid of signs of moral truth embodied in written language.

"Man may have by nature an intuition of the being of God, but he has no knowledge of the *character of God*; but that character has been revealed in accordance with the process of linguistic development, and in adaptation to man's nature and wants, in the Old and New Testaments.

"Man is a being of faith, and can be affected by the character and will of God only by the exercise of faith. Faith naturally looks out of self for its objects. The past, the future, God and the spiritual world are without the soul, as revealed by faith.

"Man is a being of conscience, but the character of conscience is determined by faith. Unless faith sees God in truth, conscience will not enforce it on the soul. But it will enforce whatever faith dictates as the character and will of God, whether right or wrong.

"Faith is in itself blind. It does not know truth from error, and reason has never had power without revelation to correct its false affirmations. The highest effort of reason is to produce doubt. (See Chapter I.) It can not substitute truth for falsehood.

"Conscience is blind. It is a potential force, but it follows faith, right or wrong, and when faith is false it enforces falsehood on the soul.

"Both faith and conscience look to God for authority, and until faith sees God in truth conscience will not convict the soul of guilt for disobedience.

"Hence, in the moral culture of the soul, every thing depends on the revelation of truth; but this truth must come to the soul, not as human opinion, or as the utterances of philosophy, but as truth, which faith and conscience recognize as rendered obligatory upon man by the will and authority of God. *Without* revealed truth *reason has no data, faith is false, and conscience is corrupt*. The erring nat-

ure of man's moral powers, without revealed truth, requires a revelation from the Maker. As there can be no moral culture with a false faith and a corrupt or dead conscience, hence a revelation of objective truth, rendered efficient by the perceived presence and authority of God, *is a moral necessity*, in order to the culture of the human soul.

"But, in order to the moral culture of man, it is not only necessary, as we have seen, that man should receive from a personal God, by faith, a revelation of truth, but certain characteristics in that truth itself are necessary—characteristics which, as we shall now show, mark the New Testament as the inspired, adapted, and final revelation of God to man.

"In view, then, of man's character and condition, notice some characteristics necessary in revealed truth, in order to his perfect and ultimate culture. A first requisite in the truth itself, in order to moral culture, is, that it should be ultimate and perfect, so that the standard may always be in advance of man's present attainment; and that it should be so revealed as to awaken and encourage aspiration and struggle for conformity to the revealed standard.

"Every one will allow that a determination of the soul from evil to good and a struggle upward, is the only method by which man can possibly attain to a better moral condition.

"But in order to awaken interest and promote effort for moral advancement, truth must be so exhibited as to show us our present moral delinquencies and derelictions. This can be done only by presenting precept and example which are above the present moral condition of the soul. It is self-evident that man can not advance to a higher position until he is convinced that his present state is a wrong one, and below attainments which he is under moral obligation to make. Divine precept and example stand as the embodied model. The effort, by divine aid, for a higher attainment in holy living, is the process by which the attainment is secured; and the attainment in which the soul finds its happiness in a spirit of love for Christ and labor of love for man, is the culture that the soul needs; and when divinely illumined by truth, it is the culture which the soul seeks.

"Now do the precepts and examples of the New Testament furnish authoritative objective truth of this character? Are they such, that while they encourage and aid, they will always be in advance of the soul, leading it up to moral perfection?

"About this question there can be no controversy. No man dare deny that if the spirit of the New Testament prevailed on earth, vice, and crime, and want, would cease among men. Neither atheists nor skeptics dare deny that the spirit of the Christian Scriptures is reverent love for God, and self-denying, happy love-labor for man. The ultimate good of all men can only be attained by those who possess good of any kind, denying themselves to bring those below them up to the good they enjoy. The New Testament spirit and example is a perfect fulfillment of this requirement. It stands alone, and high as heaven above every thing else known to the human mind in the spiritual good of all men. The devil dare not deny that the labor and sacrifice of Christ for the good of men is ultimate. Nothing can be higher, holier, or in any respect better, than the precept, the spirit, and the example of the New Testament. It has ever been in advance of human character, and will be till the end of time. It is ultimate in spirit, in precept, and in example; and it is not profane to say that if there be any other revelation, or if God give any other, it must be a worse one, because there can not be a better."

Here we rest. If the reader can not be persuaded by M'Laurin, Keach, Herder, Chalmers, and Walker (author of the last work quoted), let him read the discourses of Peter and Paul, and we think he will rise from the reading convinced that faith comes, not by mystic regeneration, but by hearing the Word of God.

---

### III.—THE SIGNIFICANCE AND PRACTICAL VALUE OF BAPTISM.\*

"BAPTISM is but a mere sign and emblem, and if any body wants a sign or an emblem that he intends to live a Christian life, I will help him to that sign. I will baptize a man fifty times if he wishes it."—HENRY WARD BEECHER.

THE words above quoted indicate the singular estimate which is placed upon baptism by the most conspicuous of American pulpit orators, and one of the most prominent of Congregational divines, a man whose high position, and character, and eminent abilities, give a certain authority to his opinions on whatever subject he may choose to express them. It will be observed, however, that it is not the principle asserted by Mr. Beecher, but only his application of it, which appears novel and strange. The idea that baptism is a mere sign and emblem has been quite generally accepted by evangelical Christians in this country, and even Baptists, however stoutly they may assert the importance of adhering strictly to the original *form* and *act* of baptism, are not generally regarded as holding any exceptional views with regard to its force and significance. We do not believe, however, that it would be easy to show that Mr. Beecher's application of the principle, apparently so generally accepted, is inadmissible. If baptism is a mere sign and emblem, then where can be the harm of a repetition of it any more than of a repetition of the supper?

We do not propose any discussion of the question here raised.

\* This article was written by a Baptist, and was declined by a Baptist publication. The writer is a scholar of acknowledged reputation in the East, and though not approving of all he says, we think his article is able and worthy a careful reading. Practically it does not differ in any material sense from our own view, though we might sometimes question the exegesis by which the author's position is sought to be established.—EDITOR.

We dissent from the premise from which Mr. Beecher's conclusion is drawn. The propriety of carefully reviewing a generally accepted position is certainly most forcibly suggested by such an inference on the part of an authority so eminent, and it is only in this view that we have placed the words above quoted at the head of this paper.

The conclusion to which the investigation thus suggested has led us, is radically different from the view which commonly prevails. We have come to believe that though baptism is undoubtedly a sign and symbol, it is not that merely, nor even chiefly and especially, but rather only incidentally and secondarily. If this idea of a sign and symbol were the only, or even the principal object of baptism, we can not, for our part, see that it would be a matter of any very great importance in any respect. Certainly it could not be regarded as a matter of universal and imperative obligation to actual believers, and to them alone, and to be submitted to by each individual once, and but once, in a life-time. It might, for aught we can see, be administered to infant or adult, churchman or separatist, Catholic or Quaker, and once or fifty times, or never at all, at the option of the subject; for of course every one who makes any pretension to Christianity is expected to give other and more satisfactory evidence of his intention to live a Christian life than can be included in this sign, whether this be made or omitted.

We shall attempt to show, in the course of this discussion, that baptism has a positive significance, an objective force, and a practical value, in comparison with which the symbol constituted by the outward act is a matter of very little importance. But let us consider for the moment how much value may properly be attached to baptism, regarded as a mere sign and emblem. In the first place, and in regard to the element or medium in which it is performed, baptism is regarded as a symbol of purification; and doubtless in the form of washing or immersing, it may be proper enough so to regard it. But who feels that his Christian life is higher, or purer, or stronger, simply because *he has made a sign* that he aims at, or has attained a purity in his conduct and character corresponding to that which the body receives from the washing of water? It is evident that this intention on his part, if it be genuine, will be more clearly manifested in other ways; and in any event, the fact of internal, spiritual purity is the thing of consequence, while the mere

external sign or symbol of it, whether distinct or obscure, is but a trifle in comparison—non-essential, in the full sense of the term.

Again, it is undoubtedly true that baptism, in reference to its original form, properly symbolizes the renunciation of the old life and the adoption of the new; a renunciation and adoption so complete as to be fittingly represented as the death and burial of the old and a resurrection to the new, in the likeness of the death and resurrection of Christ. But the symbol in this case was so far from being important that we have reason to believe it was not generally understood even in the apostolic Churches. Paul was obliged to explain it to the Roman Christians long after their baptism, and Baptist clergymen of the present day follow his example rather for a denominational purpose than because they suppose it to make any material difference with the Christian life of the convert, whether he understands it or not. Many at least succeed tolerably well in the Christian life without making the sign in this form at all.

Again, baptism is doubtless, practically, a profession of Christianity, or a form of initiation into the visible Church; or at least such it would be if this effect were not to a considerable extent annulled by right hands of fellowship, infant baptism, and other devices. But it seems to have had this effect rather incidentally than of design from the beginning. At least it seems certain that this was not its principal design. We have the commands, *Be baptized in the name of Christ*; *Be baptized for the remission of sins*; but never, *Be baptized that all men may know that you are a member of the Church*. We have the statement that baptism is the answer of a good conscience toward God, but no statement from which we can even infer that it is in its nature or principal design a sign of admission into the visible Church. In the case of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip, of the baptism of Saul at Damascus, of the baptism of the jailer by night, and doubtless in many similar instances, it could not have had this significance at all. In fact, publicity in baptism seems never to have been aimed at in the Church of the apostolic period. There is not the slightest evidence that any baptism was ever deferred until it could be witnessed by an assembly of Christians, or others. The believer was of course expected to confess his Christianity not only in baptism, but also in other ways and upon all suitable occasions.



But there are many Christians, especially in our own denomination, who will doubtless meet us at this point by saying, It is true that we are not baptized in order, as the principal object of our baptism, to make a sign of purification, nor of death to sin and resurrection to holiness, nor even to let men know that we are Christians, and belong to the Church; but we are baptized because baptism is plainly commanded by Christ, and it is our duty to obey the command.

This reasoning is doubtless correct, so far as it goes, and in the light of it we may see even more clearly than before, how slight is the importance which attaches to baptism, regarded as a mere sign and symbol. If it had not been commanded men would never have discovered any essential propriety in the act, nor would it have been adopted as a peculiarly appropriate symbol of any truth of Christian experience, nor as essentially the best method of professing faith in Christ. It is plain, therefore, that the importance of baptism as a sign and symbol is due entirely to the command which enforces it, and without which it never could have become an institution in the Church.

But is the obligation of baptism, therefore, merely or mainly that of obedience to an arbitrary command? Is baptism, in its principal design and value, a test of obedience? In its present use or abuse, it does doubtless have the effect of such a test. The degree of conscientiousness of the candidate, the readiness and completeness of his obedience, are doubtless indicated more or less accurately by his treatment of this ordinance. But we can not believe that this was the principal design in its institution. It is hardly consistent with the spirit of Christianity, in which, as friends and brethren, we are permitted to know what our Lord doeth, that an arbitrary command should thus be imposed whose highest significance should consist in the fact that it would test our willingness to obey. God knows the heart too well to need any such test, nor is this the severest or most infallible test of Christian conduct and character of which men can avail themselves, in judging themselves or each other. We still believe that baptism has a purpose and importance far greater than any which has thus far been considered.

What, then, is the primary significance and the principal value of baptism? We will state our opinion first, and then prove it if we can.

Baptism, in our view, is first and principally *the believer's act of acceptance of the terms of salvation*. It is the act appointed of God to be rendered for this purpose and in this significance; and when thus rendered, according to its original design and import, it entitles the subject to the assurance that his sins are forgiven, and the new believer is at once admitted to all the privileges and immunities of the kingdom of Christ.

It will of course be admitted that there must be an acceptance of the terms of salvation on the part of the sinner, in one form or another, either voluntary or prescribed. It is possible to conceive of such acceptance as consisting merely in a state of feeling disposing the sinner to accept and obey the truth. But aside from the fact that such a disposition of mind is not always accompanied by a consciousness of forgiveness, it is evident that the feeling itself may soon be replaced by others of a different nature, and that the disposition of acceptance and consciousness of adoption, if it existed at all, must pass away with it. A mere disposition of mind or state of feeling, therefore, can not be regarded as a sufficient acceptance of the terms of salvation.

Again, the state of feeling above supposed may be accompanied by a firm resolve and purpose on the part of the believer, but entirely within himself, and expressed to no other being, to walk according to the Gospel rule. Yet the views of truth upon which both feeling and purpose are founded are likely, through the pressure of worldly cares, to become less vivid, the purpose itself will almost inevitably become weaker, and perhaps pass wholly from the mind. The individual has taken upon himself no obligation as due to Christ, or his followers. He is of course at liberty to recede from his own purpose. He has never committed himself in any way. Such a feeling and purpose then do not constitute a valid acceptance of Christ and his Gospel.

Suppose, again, that the sinner's acceptance be expressed in audible words addressed to the invisible Savior, promising obedience to his commands, and claiming forgiveness according to the offers of the Gospel. Still, in moments of indifference and unfaithfulness, or of discouragement and despondency, questions like the following would almost inevitably arise in his mind: How do I know that he heard me when I spoke, or regarded my words if he heard? How do I

know that my sins are forgiven? I spoke to the still air and received no response. I can not be certain that the feeling in my heart, the impression on my mind, which, for the time, seemed to assure me, and upon which I was at length enabled to indulge a trembling hope, had in itself any thing of the nature of a divine communication. It may be accounted for in other ways. It was, perhaps, merely the working of my own imagination, or a mere natural revulsion of feeling. I know not that I am in any covenant with Christ, or that he has done aught for me. For it must be remembered that the new believer, in the first feeble effort of his faith, has not yet attained to that conscious communion with God which often comes only with years of progress in the divine life, certainly not in such a degree as to enable him to dispense with ordinances and covenant signs. God, therefore, for reasons like those above adduced, and to aid the new believer's faith, has chosen that the sinner's acceptance of the terms of salvation should be made in the form of a solemn, impressive act; an act, too, which he can not perform alone and of himself, and so forget or disregard it, but one in which Christ himself also appears as represented by the administrator of the ordinance, or by the Church acting in his name. And it is this act, namely, baptism, which gives to conversion the nature of a real transaction, instead of leaving it in the form of a mere mental exercise, whose impressions would naturally pass rapidly from the mind. The anxious believer may doubt whether Christ heard his prayer, and regarded his verbal promise of obedience, and accorded him forgiveness. Many, in fact, do thus doubt. But no one who, in honesty of purpose, has rendered this solemn token of his acceptance of the terms of salvation, can doubt that Christ saw and acknowledged the act, because he appointed it himself for this very purpose, and to be rendered in this significance; and one who acts in his name and by his authority administers the rite. He may, therefore, assure himself of forgiveness, not on the strength of a passing emotion, but on the truth of the sure promise of God, attested by his own appointed covenant sign. For baptism, which, viewed on its human side, is the believer's act of acceptance of the terms of salvation, becomes, on its divine side, *God's covenant sign of forgiveness and adoption.*

Such a covenant sign, as belonging to the New Testament dispensation of God's grace, would also seem natural and necessary, and

would be in accordance with the whole course of his dealings with men as narrated in the inspired record. It was by a covenant sign that he established his covenant with Noah, and Abraham, and their posterity, and with Moses and the children of Israel. Significant acts as covenant signs were also common among men when written agreements were inconvenient or impossible. Even to this day men are said to "strike a bargain" because it was once customary to strike hands as a sign that their contract was faithful and sure. The Greeks were said to "pour a treaty," because the pouring of wine in libation to the gods was the sign commonly used to indicate the solemn earnestness and faithfulness of the transaction. And surely, no one who is aware of the customs, in these regards, which prevailed anciently among men, or who is familiar with the Old Testament record of God's dealings with his people, would ever imagine that the new covenant, in which Christ establishes his personal relation to every believer, would be promulgated without a covenant sign. Such a course would be contrary to all analogy or precedent, whether human or divine. Now, it is unquestionably true, that baptism, in the act itself, is admirably adapted to symbolize the great facts of which it is the appointed legitimate expression. It is also eminently appropriate that the act should thus symbolize the fact which it signifies. But it were better that the symbol should never be understood or perceived at all, as in hundreds of instances it was not and is not, than that the ordinance should come to be regarded as *merely* a symbol, while its own appropriate force and significance are overlooked and forgotten.

To dispense with baptism in its proper original import must, we may be certain, create a serious practical difficulty in the work of evangelization, rendering the process of conversion itself difficult, complicated, and unintelligible. And it becomes us seriously to inquire whether, in the usual course of evangelical effort, a need is not actually and invariably felt of just such an institution as baptism, according to the design above indicated; whether, indeed, converts do not almost invariably meet with a difficulty just at the point where baptism ought properly to stand, a difficulty which was unknown in the earlier times of Christianity, and which would now be unknown if we were to administer baptism in its proper place and significance; whether, in fact, in our present administration of the ordinance, we do not wait till the real need of it is passed, and then go through

the form of the act merely for the sake of the form, or as a mere figurative representation of a fact already accomplished without it, a fact, too, which, according to our own theory, the symbol thus enacted can neither confirm nor improve.

We have now indicated our views of the primary purpose and practical value of baptism with sufficient clearness, we trust, to make them easily comprehensible. We do not yet, however, assume to have proved our positions, or, rather, we do not propose to content ourselves with the *a priori* style of argument above presented. As a Protestant, and especially as a Baptist, we are well aware that neither this nor any other view of baptism is worth a moment's consideration unless it can be established by positive proofs, drawn legitimately and immediately from the Word of God. But as a Protestant and a Baptist we do not believe that the plain statements of fact and principle in the New Testament are ever to be passed over as if they had no meaning at all, even if they do not seem to favor commonly received opinions. We must take the Word of God as we find it, and allow to it fully and fairly its proper natural significance. And if there proves to be a difference between its teachings and our present views, we should conform even our most approved orthodox ideas to it as the infallible standard rather than allow ourselves to suppose that it does not mean what it says, or even that it contains inapt, awkward, unguarded, inaccurate statements of truths which we seem to perceive more clearly than did the sacred writers themselves. In no other way can the inspired Word retain the place which we profess to assign it as the rule of faith and practice in our Churches.

We have stated that baptism is first and chiefly the believer's act of acceptance of the terms of salvation, the same act, when viewed on its divine side, being God's covenant sign of forgiveness and adoption.

The terms of salvation are repentance and faith; and baptism, if it be what we have asserted, must be the act by which the believer commits himself to these terms; that is, it must be the legitimate, appointed, authorized expression of repentance and faith; and on the other hand if it be the appointed and accepted testimony of repentance and faith, it must be the legitimate, authorized act of acceptance of the terms of salvation.

Let us commence the investigation with the baptism of John,

which, though it is to be clearly distinguished from Christian baptism, has yet so much in common with the latter that a proper understanding of it can not fail to contribute materially to the purposes of our discussion. The work and mission of John are announced by Mark in the words, "*John came baptizing in the wilderness, and preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.*" Luke says, "He came into all the country about the Jordan, *preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.*" Observe, it is here stated that John preached *baptism for the remission of sins*. Yet there is clearly no natural, legitimate connection between baptism and forgiveness. Surely, neither baptism nor any other single, arbitrary act can have any thing to do with remission of sins. Such an idea would be contrary to the whole course of New Testament teaching, and to the whole tenor of evangelical belief. Yet both Evangelists plainly declare that John preached *baptism for the remission of sins*, and the whole matter would remain as a stumbling-block in the believer's path were it not for the addition of a single word explaining the nature of the baptism that John preached. We can understand the connection between repentance and forgiveness, and when we learn that it was the *baptism of repentance* which John preached, for the remission of sins, the difficulty at once vanishes. But let us here observe that repentance, in this case, is not merely a condition of admission to baptism, the two being otherwise distinct and separate from each other. Baptism is interposed between repentance and forgiveness, not to separate but rather to unite them. The baptism itself *stands for* repentance, and in itself means repentance. It was repentance which characterized the act, and gave it all the significance it had. The baptism of John was a baptism of REPENTANCE, and it could avail for the forgiveness of sins only as it was a baptism of repentance—only as it was the divinely appointed sign and testimony of repentance, the solemn, emphatic declaration of a purpose to turn from sin. It is important, also, to notice the object as well as the significance of the baptism of John. This object was the remission of sins. The inducement held out by John that the people might turn from their sins in preparation for the expected Messiah, and submit to baptism in testimony of their purpose so to do, was the forgiveness of their sins, which was promised on these conditions; and the baptism he administered was as much the seal of such forgiveness as



it was the sign and testimony of genuine repentance, of an honest, earnest purpose of ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well. Such, then, in its purpose and significance was the baptism of John. No looser construction will do justice to the simple, concise announcement of the Evangelists, "*He came preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.*"

Proceeding now to the fully developed baptism of the Church as instituted on the day of Pentecost, we find that it differs both in its significance and in its purpose from the baptism of John, or rather that a distinct element has been added to each. John told his followers that they must believe on Him who should come after him. The Christ had now been revealed and his work on earth was completed. Instead, therefore, of an indefinite belief in a Messiah soon to appear, a definite, positive belief in Jesus as the Christ was now required; and in addition to remission of sins, the Holy Spirit was conferred upon baptism into the required faith.

Baptism, therefore, was now not only a *baptism of repentance*, but also and more especially, a *baptism of faith in Christ*. Converts were baptized *in* or *into* or *upon the name of Christ*, the act being thus characterized in the most emphatic terms as an expression and adoption of the faith that Jesus is the Son of God. Thus, to the two negative elements included in the baptism of John, the two more vital, positive elements of belief in Christ and the gift of the Spirit were now added. Peter not only says, Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, but also, Be baptized *upon the name of Christ*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Baptism, therefore, as enjoined by Peter, was the legitimate, authorized expression *both of repentance and of faith*. In other words, it was the believer's full and formal acceptance of the terms of salvation. The objects attained by this baptism were both remission of sins and the gift of the Spirit; or, in other words, the baptism of repentance and faith was also God's covenant sign of forgiveness and adoption, and the whole is indicated by Peter in one compact sentence, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit*.

The view above taken finds striking and explicit confirmation in the incident related in the first part of the nineteenth chapter of the Acts. Paul fell in with certain disciples at Ephesus, in whose Chris-

tian life and development something was apparently wanting. He says to them, Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed? They reply, We have not even heard of the Holy Spirit. Paul then asks, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? clearly implying that baptism in the name of Christ should properly secure the gift of the Spirit. They reply, Unto John's baptism. The case was now clear. They had received only the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Paul says to them in substance, John baptized with the baptism of repentance, which, indeed, is one essential element of Christian baptism, but in reference to the other element he could only tell the people to believe on Him who was to come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ. If, therefore, ye now believe that Jesus is the Christ, be baptized in token of this belief, as ye were before baptized in testimony of your purpose to turn from sin, and in addition to remission of sins ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. They were accordingly baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and received the Holy Spirit; that is, the baptism of faith in Christ was to them God's covenant sign of adoption.

We find further confirmation of our position in the words of Ananias to Saul, recorded in Acts xxii, 16, especially when we consider the circumstances under which they were uttered. The conversion of Saul was complete, at least it needed only baptism to complete it. The urgency of Ananias, therefore, could have no reference to Saul's mental state, but to his baptism alone, and the result to be thereby attained. There could be no doubt in his mind as to the genuineness of Saul's experience, nor of the sincerity of his purpose, though it appears that his sins were still unforgiven. Ananias knew, therefore, that Saul was prepared in the condition of his mind to take the decisive step which would give form and significance to his repentance and faith. He ought at once to render to God the appointed sign of his belief that Jesus is the Christ, and of his honest purpose of obedience to him, and in the solemn, conscientious fulfillment of the appointed act, by which he would adopt this faith and commit himself to this purpose, he would be entitled to the assurance that his sins were forgiven. We see, then, how appropriate and significant are the words of Ananias, *And now, why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.*

But the most direct and positive proof of our position that bap-

tism is primarily the believer's act of acceptance of the terms of salvation is found in 1 Pet. iii, 21. This, indeed, is the only instance in the New Testament in which baptism is defined in reference to its proper nature and significance, and even here it seems to be done only indirectly and incidentally rather than because the writer supposed that a matter so common and obvious could require definition. The apostle, then, was not writing any thing which he considered hard to be understood, or which he imagined would be so regarded by those to whom his epistle was addressed, and we need not, therefore, seek out any far-fetched interpretation of his words. The simplest explanation will be most likely to be true. Peter, in the passage referred to, speaks of baptism as *the answer of a good conscience toward God*, declaring that, as such, it saves us. To give now the most simple and natural construction of the passage, allowing to each word its proper force, we should say that the word "answer" invariably and of necessity implies a question, and that baptism is the answer, and the right answer, to this question.\* What, then, is the question to which baptism is thus an answer? What, indeed, could it be but the great question which God addresses to all men in the promulgation of the Gospel, namely, Dost thou believe that Jesus is the Christ, and wilt thou turn from all sin and obey his commands, that thou mayest be saved? If baptism is the answer of a good conscience to this question, it must signify, In this, the appointed and accepted way, I declare my faith in the Son of God, and my honest purpose of obedience to him. I hereby commit myself to this faith, and to the course of life it requires. Observe that the answer is said to be "*toward God*," and that the significance of baptism is therefore Godward rather than Churchward or manward. Now, if the above is properly the significance of baptism as the answer of a good conscience toward God, we can readily see how it can be said to save us, and we need not accuse Peter of a leaning toward any absurd doctrine of baptismal regeneration, nor of being a blundering writer or stupid theologian.

But this is not the only passage which requires a similar explanation if we would save the credit of the sacred writers for sound theology and an intelligible use of language. Paul himself is in the cat-

\* The word "question" is not only implied, but is also expressed in the Greek *ἀπεκρίθη*, which might be fully and literally rendered "answer to a question."

alogue of baptismal regenerationists, unless there is a significance in baptism which relieves him from the charge, for he says, in Titus iii, 5, *According to his mercy hath he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit*—a passage where baptism plainly comes in for a share in the salvation that is wrought. The passages above quoted, also, namely, *Be baptized for the remission of sins, Be baptized and wash away thy sins*, have evidently a similar bearing.

Now there are three ways of dealing with this class of passages. The first is to regard baptism as an *opus operatum*, by which an efficient grace is, as it were, artificially administered to renew and regenerate the subject, which is the Popish view universally repudiated by Protestants; another is to subject the passages themselves to a process of explanation or reduction, by which their proper natural force, or at least all their obnoxious significance is in general successfully eliminated, a very common way of dealing with Scripture among the Protestant sects; the third is to allow to baptism a significance which would in the divine order be followed by such results as the language above quoted may justly and properly describe. The last is the only method which we may conscientiously or safely adopt.

We trust that we have now made our positions sufficiently clear, and also that our proofs will generally be regarded as satisfactory by those who are accustomed to allow to the Word of God its proper authority.

But there is another argument to be drawn from what is termed the historical development of the doctrine of baptism, which, to certain classes of minds, will perhaps seem more conclusive than the testimony of Scripture itself. Our position is, that baptism is the divinely appointed sign to be rendered by the believer as his valid, faithful acceptance of the terms of salvation, and that the same act becomes to him God's covenant sign of forgiveness and adoption. Observe, now, that we have only to forget the significance of baptism on its subjective or human side, while we retain its proper force and import on its divine or objective side, to bring us directly to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. The tendency thus to forget in an unenlightened and superstitious age would be natural, perhaps inevitable; and the fact that the above-named perversion followed so soon after the days of the apostles, can not but be regarded as a

striking confirmation of the view above taken. We find traces of the error which could thus easily and naturally arise, in the very earliest of the Christian Fathers, as Clement, Irenæus, and Tertullian. Of course it did not originate with these celebrated teachers. It rather existed as an already established and generally prevalent tendency in the times when they wrote, and as such was accepted by them.

Now it is not easy to explain the transition, if we suppose the common idea of baptism as the mere external sign of an internal grace already complete, having in fact no connection whatever with forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit, to have been the original doctrine. Such a view could not be readily transformed into that of baptismal regeneration, which attributed a magical virtue to the water, and regarded the whole as an *opus operatum*. It is evident that the two can not have either logical or immediate historical connection. The one could not succeed readily and naturally to the other. The more modern view is rather a violent reaction to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, a result of the uncompromising hostility of Protestants to the perversions of Popery, aided, doubtless, in later times, by the controversies between immersionists and sprinklers, by which there has been developed an evident tendency on the part of the latter to depreciate the importance of the ordinance. The modern error is doubtless less dangerous than the former, but is perhaps equally distant from the true doctrine. The one view is too exclusively objective; the other too exclusively subjective. The one makes baptism an *opus operatum*, absolutely essential to salvation; the other leads men to take such liberties with the ordinance as essentially to degrade it and destroy its practical utility.

Our interest in the investigation of this subject was much increased when we learned—what we did not know at its commencement—that it covers the principal ground of difference between two great bodies of immersionists known respectively as Baptists and Disciples, and that movements have already been instituted looking to a closer harmony, and the ultimate union of the two bodies. The Disciples, though as yet scarcely heard of in the Eastern States, are a vigorous and powerful body in the West. So far as we have been able to apprehend their positions, they insist strongly upon the

objective side of the doctrine of baptism, declaring in the language of Scripture, that it is *for the remission of sins*, and that believers are to seek in this ordinance the assurance of forgiveness and adoption. They do not, however, seem to perceive, or at least they do not sufficiently assert, the proper subjective significance of the rite. This, we believe, is their error, and one of the weakest points in their system. To insist upon the objective force of the ordinance without perceiving the positive significance upon which the results they attribute to it must properly depend, is to defy the religious philosophy of the age, and reminds one unpleasantly of the doctrine of an arbitrary efficiency attaching to the sacraments, which is no longer advocated except in the Church of Rome. The strength of this party consists in their unswerving fidelity to the Word of God, the boldness with which they insist upon the plain language of Scripture in asserting the objective force and value of the ordinance, always preferring the simple teachings of the inspired Word to the deductions of philosophy wherever they do not perceive an essential harmony between the two.

The Baptists, in considerable portion at least, have generally been understood to accept the idea that baptism is a mere external sign of a fact already accomplished, having in itself no positive or objective force except that it is a means, and, as they assert, the only acceptable means of becoming a member of the visible Church for one who is already a member of the Church invisible. In this view, as we have endeavored to explain above, the original significance and the practical value of the ordinance is in great measure lost. But within a few months past an article has appeared from the pen of one of the clearest thinkers and ablest writers in the denomination, in which a different view of the ordinance is suggested. The article discusses the nature of the rite with reference to its relation to the communion; and besides language which plainly declares the symbolical import of baptism, it contains statements which as clearly indicate that aside from its symbolical import it has a significance of its own—a significance which would remain in full force and value even if no symbol were contained in the act.

Among the statements are the following: "It is the bath (washing) of regeneration, accompanying and sealing the renewing of the Holy Ghost." "It stands at the gateway of the believer's course."



"It is his act of enlistment, of consecration, and its proper significance would be lost either by postponement or by repetition"—which of course would not be the case if its import were mainly symbolical. And again: "It appears every-where as the new-born believer's mode of turning his back upon his former life of sin, and of dedicating himself henceforth" (that is, from the time of his baptism) "to a life of devotion to Christ." The nature of the ordinance is further illustrated by comparison with the *sacramentum*, or military oath, of the Roman soldier, by which he swore allegiance to his commander and took upon himself the obligations of a faithful soldier. The writer, indeed, does not say that baptism is the repenting sinner's act of acceptance of the terms of salvation, but he says, emphatically, that it is by divine appointment "the *first* act consequent upon and declaratory of his acceptance of Christ as a Savior." It can not, therefore, be far from the act of acceptance itself. If baptism means at least, "I have *just now* accepted Christ," why should it not and more naturally mean, "I do hereby accept him?" Indeed, it is evident that, practically, this is the only way in which the "just now" can be included. And if baptism means only, "I have accepted," why should it not mean, "I have accepted within the past month, or the past year?" If it may refer the acceptance of Christ to an indefinite time in the past, then there is no urgency as to the time of its administration. There could certainly be no propriety in saying, as Ananias said to Saul, "*And now, why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.*"

The writer further says: "If we are commanded to be baptized at all, we are commanded to be baptized in the place and for the purpose in and for which the rite is enjoined. To remove it from this place is an act of disobedience," is, in fact, "not merely changing the place of an ordinance," but is "setting aside and nullifying it."

Now it is apparent that according to the above-quoted statements and explanations, baptism must have a positive force and significance by which the believer is brought into new relations to the great Captain of his salvation. Otherwise it could not be his act of enlistment, or bear any essential resemblance to the *sacramentum* of the Roman soldier. The position of the writer, therefore, in reference to the significance of the ordinance on its human side is not materially different from that which we have advocated above.

The paper from which these expressions are quoted has been widely circulated among Baptists, and no exception has been taken to its positions. On the contrary, it has every-where received the warmest commendation, and the highest authorities seem to be in agreement with and upon it. It may, therefore, justly be regarded as indicating the true sense of the denomination relative to the nature and significance of baptism.

And it is indeed time that Baptists, while contending that baptism is in its own nature prerequisite to communion, should begin to dispel the impression that they regard the ordinance as merely the external sign of an internal grace already complete, so that the believer is essentially no better prepared for the communion after baptism than before it.

If, then, as we may reasonably suppose, the paper above referred to expresses the hitherto unexpressed sense of the denomination in regard to the significance of baptism, it will appear that the Baptists hold one side of the true doctrine of baptism, while the Disciples are equally correct in their apprehension of the other side; and a union of the two would give us not only a united and powerful Christian body, but also *a whole doctrine of baptism*. And if there are no reasons for continued division except those which relate to this subject, then surely a union of the two parties is every way desirable, and would seem to be also eminently practicable. For surely the Disciples, while holding to the objective force and value of the ordinance, can not object to receiving the truth equally Scriptural as to its proper, positive significance, and which, by explaining its objective results, will relieve them of all suspicion of sympathy with a Popish doctrine of the sacraments.

Nor can the Baptists, while holding to the positive significance of the ordinance on its human side, consistently deny the results which, by divine appointment, belong to it as a valid and formal acceptance of the terms of salvation, and which are as plainly attested by the language of Scripture as they are legitimate and proper in themselves. Nor should they, as the party which derives its name and distinctive features from this ordinance, content themselves with asserting its original form, nor with protesting that there is no Scriptural authority for its application to infants. The truth on these two subjects is already sufficiently clear to those who are willing to

receive it. Let them, therefore, proceed to a full accomplishment of their mission as the denomination to whom God, in his providence, has given this important ordinance in charge to preserve and transmit according to all its original significance and consequence. Let them investigate and teach not only the form, but also the original purpose of the rite; its inherent nature and significance; its objective validity and its practical utility, and thus endeavor to restore it to the place from which it has fallen through centuries of misapprehension and perversion. For it is contrary to the whole tenor of the Gospel system to suppose that baptism is a merely arbitrary institution, without significance except as a symbol or as a test of obedience. It was rather instituted for a practical purpose, and if administered at the proper time, and according to its original significance, it would have a most important practical utility; and the need of such a rite in such a significance is even now felt by the Churches in their efforts for evangelization. But removing it from its proper place in the scheme of redemption, from its legitimate connection with the great facts of which it is the appointed and accepted expression, and the promises it entitles the believer to claim, virtually destroys its practical significance, and makes it comparatively a useless and arbitrary appendage. Baptism merely to symbolize a fact which is believed to be already accomplished, is, after all, not essentially different in its nature and import from baptism to prefigure a fact which the parents of infant children suppose they may confidently expect. And if we are to baptize only in order that we may obey, still our obedience can not be complete and acceptable unless we baptize *when we are commanded to baptize*, when baptism can have the force and significance it was originally designed to include. If we are to perform the act when it can be but a mere symbol, and answer no important practical end, is it not as great a perversion of the ordinance as to replace the act itself by another of our own choosing? Let us therefore seriously ponder the question *whether the place of the ordinance has not been changed without divine permission or authority*, and whether its original significance and practical value must not also inevitably have disappeared in the change. The sacred record alone can answer these questions for us. Let us listen faithfully to its testimony, and bow reverently to its decisions.

## IV.—ANTHROPOLOGY.

THE classical scholar needs no definition of the word that heads this article, for it is formed by the union of two of the commonest words in the Greek language. He was made acquainted with them when he entered upon the study of that beautiful tongue, and he has read, no author since in which they are not of frequent occurrence. But for the sake of the mere English reader we may state that *Anthropos*, which forms the first part of the word, means a human being, the same that is called in Latin *homo*. Man, as man, or mankind, human nature, or man generically, is the idea which these words *anthropos*, *homo*, man, represent respectively to a Greek, a Latin, and an English ear. *Logos*, the other part of the compound word, is not susceptible of so simple a definition, though it is in Greek as common as the other. Still, as far as the case in hand is concerned, its meaning is not equivocal. It usually means thought or the expression of thought, reason or the word that is the sign of that idea. In the latter sense it is often rendered word, treatise, science. This last is its meaning in the term at the head of this piece.

Anthropology is, then, the science of man. In this definition man is used objectively. It is not the science that is formulated by man, but the science that has man for its object; the science concerning our nature, our whole nature, as consisting of a body, a soul, and a spirit. We are not unaware that in this materialistic age many give this expressive term a much narrower application, referring it merely to the body as possessed of life; but how unphilosophical this is will appear in the sequel.

As this word has been employed in different senses, according to the different theories of our nature held by those using it, we may be indulged in some latitude while fixing the sense in which we shall use it, even though we should be considered tedious. Its common acceptation is, 1. "A discourse upon human nature; 2. The doctrine of the structure of the human body: the natural history or physiology of the human species; 3. More definitely, the science of

man considered physically, intellectually, and morally, or in his entire nature ; 4. The word denotes that manner of expression by which the inspired writers attribute human parts and passions to God." So deposes our great lexicographer, Noah Webster, from whom we select this as the meaning that suits our present purpose : "The science of man in his entire nature."

What is that nature? Is its essence found in matter alone, organized or unorganized? Is it found in spirit alone, embodied or disembodied? Is it not rather found in the marvelous union of a divine spirit with an organized body? This last is the Scriptural idea of man, and all true science that bears at all upon the question will be found to harmonize with it when the principles of that science are understood. To show this is the purpose of the writer, and in working out that purpose he will allow himself, by the reader's permission, considerable range of discussion as to the subject-matter, while in style he will be as free and easy and as clear of technicalities as the nature of the theme will permit.

If the facts stated in the Word of God concerning man's being created in the image of God, receiving his body from the dust of the earth, and his soul from the inspiration of the Almighty be not true, if they can be shown to contradict the teachings of reason, the inductions of science, or the deductions of a sound philosophy, then the rationalist, the scientist, and the philosopher may find some apology for their crime in discarding the revelation of the Holy Spirit, and seeking to reduce all things to the material, the finite, and the perishable. Again, if man's fall by disobedience, and his consequent adjudication to death, entailing upon his posterity a nature weak, corruptible, and sinful, subject to disease on the one hand, and mental and spiritual imbecility on the other, and all eventuating in death, temporal and eternal ; if, we say, this does not accord with the observation and experience of the race, in that case there is no basis for a remedial system, or for any religion at all worthy of the name. There is no place for a Redeemer, and all the groans and pains of a suffering humanity, the hopes, and aspirations, and longings of men for a perfect political state, and a higher, purer, happier life as they come to the surface in the writings of antiquity, heathen, Jewish, and Christian, are all doomed to go out in a cheerless and everlasting night. There is another consequence that results from a denial of

the Scriptural anthropology as deduced from the facts of man's creation by God, his apostasy through disobedience, and his subjection to death; it is that there can be for his spirit no future state. The death of the body is the death of the spirit as well. Indeed, there is no ground to say man has a spirit at all if the ultimate unit of his being be a cell containing an infinitesimal quantity of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. Hydrogen with oxygen forms water; carbon and oxygen united forms carbonic acid, and hydrogen joined with nitrogen constitutes ammonia. "Now take these compounds," says Huxley, "the water, the carbonic acid, and the ammonia, and you have in their union protoplasm, or the physical basis of life." Here, then, we have but an aggregation of binaries exhibiting only the properties of matter, and when these separate the basis of life is gone, and all ends in death. We shall show that the Bible reveals a life of the spirit out of the body, beginning at the death of the latter, and extending to its resurrection from the grave, and its assumption by that same spirit preparatory to an eternal life in the presence of God, and all that is holy, and pure, and good in his glorious universe.

These, then, are the elements of a Scriptural anthropology:

1. Man created in the image of God.
2. His fall through disobedience and consequent death.
3. His restoration to God's favor through Christ.
4. His conscious existence from death till the resurrection.
5. The resurrection of his body from the grave, and the eternal union of the purified spirit with its glorified and spiritual body in the realization of the full redemption wrought out for him by the love of God, the grace of Christ, and the quickening power of the Holy Spirit.

The reader will observe that these five statements are most comprehensive. Out of them may be evolved all that is needful for a synthesis that shall present before his mind humanity in all the phases of its life, and being, from the moment it waked into conscious existence in the first Adam through the centuries of its sins, its sorrows, and its struggles in the present state; its waiting in blessed hope with patriarchs, prophets, and apostles in the "unseen," and its final assumption of a resurrected body, and entrance into everlasting life. It must be clear that these elements of the only really consistent anthropology are given us by revelation. They correlate man and God, the human and the divine, the finite and the infinite in all



their manifestations of matter and mind in the former, and in the latter the threefold manifestations of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in merciful co-operation to create, redeem, and glorify the whole man, body, soul, and spirit. No genius, however transcendent, is competent to solve the mystery of our being that does not make these factors in the intricate problem; but once let faith accept, on the testimony of Him who can not lie, these oracles of divine wisdom and eternal truth, and all is consistent, reasonable, and worthy of our acceptance. If it be the prerogative of revelation to give us the true science of man, it is equally so of reason to confirm it, and this she will always do when not perverted by a false and deceptive philosophy. It is only when blinded by prejudice, inflated by pride, or divorced from the divine fountain of light and truth that she essays to establish an antagonism between nature and man, God and nature, or man and God. As both man and nature are the offspring of God, no true science of the one or the other, be it physical or metaphysical, *a priori* or *a posteriori*, inductive or deductive, will ever banish him from his creation, or consign his noblest work, the image of himself and the object of his infinite love, to an everlasting sleep.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." What voice of reason or science will ever gainsay this sublime utterance that opens the drama of creation? The human race is now closing its sixth millennium, and from the dawn of philosophy men have been seeking a better cosmogony; have they found it? Will they ever find it? Is such a thing discoverable? Begin to ascend in the history of any science from the period of its fullest development to its primordial elements, and its final result, its last utterance will be "In the beginning God." And so it is if we follow to its highest unfolding any subject of human thought; its completed synthesis will give as its closing generalization, God, the unit of all being, while its last analysis will resolve all things into him as their end. He is indeed the beginning and the end of all things. Something is, therefore, something always was, and something always will be, is an old aphorism of philosophy, but it is not less true than old, nor will the world ever be old enough to prove it false. Men may fight against the "*Ex nihilo nihil fit*" as long as they please, but the world will continue to believe that "from nothing nothing ever springs." Was, then, that something matter or spirit, or both? Atheism says the first, the

skeptical scientists say the last, for with them spirit is merely a function of matter; the Bible, and reason, and science unite in saying that that something was spirit.

We are now prepared to advance a step in the confirmation of the first article in the creed of a Scriptural anthropologist: Man was made in the image of God. In the creation of matter, and in molding it into all its diversified forms to serve as a dwelling-place for rational beings, it was sufficient for the Creator to say, "Let it be," but when he would place a crown upon all his works and set the child of his love, before the hosts of heaven, he prefaces his act with the words, "Let us make man in our image." The Elohim in the plurality of his own ineffable being summons the persons and attributes that form the Scripture idea of God to the final and grandest exercise of their omnific power, and man is made of the earth as to his mortal body, but of a divine spirit as to his soul. That his mind, or soul, or spirit is not body or matter, is a truth that is assumed through the entire revelation of God. It is never spoken of as a thing to be proved, but to be accepted as undoubted as that Jehovah himself exists, or that he is spirit. If testimony were needed to establish this statement, we have it in the miserable, I might say wicked, subterfuges of those materialists who profess to receive the Bible as an inspired book. It is not necessary to quote specific texts to show that the distinction of body and spirit, matter and mind is held by the inspired writers when their whole phraseology is based upon the fact. To make them mean any thing else requires an exegesis that is simply below criticism. If "the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it," and if we are warned by him who spake as never man spake, "not to fear them who kill the body, and then have no more that they can do, but to fear him who, after he has killed the body, has power to cast both body and soul into hell," and if these passages are in harmony with all that is said of body and spirit in both Old Testament and New, any thing we may adduce farther must be taken as *ex abundantia*. David, speaking prophetically of Christ, says in the sixteenth Psalm, "Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Peter, in the second chapter of Acts, quotes this passage, and applies it in proof of the resurrection of our Lord.

We use it here only to show that the idea of soul or spirit as entity distinct from the corruptible flesh is clearly recognized in the Scriptures. It may be remarked in passing, that the Hebrew word *sheol* and the Greek *hades*, found in the original and in the Septuagint translation of this passage, mean, in English, the *unseen*, and ought not to have been rendered *hell*. They should never be so rendered; but of this more directly.

Our God is "the God of the spirits of all flesh." We are "to glorify him with our body and our spirit, which are his." Though "our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." We are exhorted "to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit." "The body without the spirit is dead." But enough! Why transcribe whole pages of the Bible to prove what is as clear as the sun?

The idea, then, that the spirit is dependent on the body for existence, or that it is a function of matter, or that we have no soul, has no place in the revelation of God, and any anthropology that requires one or another of these to be made good, is anti-scriptural and subversive of "the faith once delivered to the saints."

Many materialists seeing how clearly the Scriptures teach the immateriality of the soul, and being more in love with their philosophy than with their Bibles, discard the latter in their skeptical adherence to the former. In this, however, they are not wise, for it may well be questioned whether their favorite dogma has any more countenance from the teachings of philosophy than from the Holy Scriptures. A few words will evince this. We know not either matter or spirit in their ground or essence. What that is, in which the qualities of the one or the properties of the other inhere, we know not and can not know. We say there are several primary, or essential properties of matter; that among these are extension, impenetrability, inertia, divisibility, indestructibility, etc., and no one ever thinks of calling this into question any more than he would his own existence. If we interrogate the psychologist he will with equal confidence tell us that the mind, or spirit, is that which thinks, feels, and wills; that the presentative, representative, reflective, and intuitive powers come under the division of the intellect; that the affections, desires, etc., constitute the sensibility, and that the will, with its motives, determinations, and purposes come under the head of

volition. In a word, the mind thinks, remembers, imagines, reasons, loves, hates, determines, and does a hundred other things we have no need to mention. Here, then, we have philosophy, natural and mental, laying their foundations in the distinction contended for, and each setting out from something admitted as the result of observation and experiment, or of self-evident truth. With a few clear definitions, an appeal to the relation of cause and effect and a well-founded method, they build up the whole structure of physical and metaphysical science.

Let us now compare a few deliverances of these great and fundamental departments of philosophy, and thus see whether our anthropology be not as accordant with it as with the Word of God. Will is a property of mind; inertia, of matter. This last is that property of matter which makes it incapable of self-motion, for it is admitted that matter moves only as it is moved—it acts only as it is acted upon. But will is that property of mind that constitutes it self-acting. It follows, then, beyond contradiction that they can not be the same substratum, seeing they possess properties which are incompatible, for that would be to say that it can be self-acting and not self-acting at the same time, which is *contradictio in adjecto*, and hence absurd. The principle of this argument is susceptible of almost indefinite expansion and illustration. But an objector will say, your argument proves too much, and is therefore valueless. Does it not prove that brutes have souls as well as men? In reply, we ask what if it does give a soul to the brute? Better do that than deprive man of his. But the argument involves no such consequence. The objection is based on a false assumption, namely, that volition in man, and inclination working by instinct in the brute, are one and the same. This can not be proved, and therefore it has no force as an objection. Men and brutes have many things in common, and it may be hard to state precisely the difference between reason in the one and instinct in the other, or to demonstrate that there is a difference in kind rather than in degree. All this may be granted and yet the argument remain unrefuted. We don't reject the idea that brutes have souls because reason or science proves it false, but because revelation does not teach it as true; if, however, it did, it would show less cruelty in giving souls to brutes than materialism in taking them away from men.

That we have an assurance of our personal identity as long as there is unbroken continuity of being, will not be denied. I know that I am the same man to-day that I was yesterday; nothing short of an extinction of my being, or what is almost as bad, the dethronement of reason in the soul, can rob me of that. Nor is this assurance of my identity confined to myself, others have it of me; the difference lies mainly in this, that each one is conscious of it in himself; no one can be conscious of it in another. Still, the assurance is sufficient for all the purposes of social life. The physiologist tells us that our body changes entirely every seven years, and this may be all true enough. But if consciousness of identity be a property of matter, even when instinct with life, how can it be retained through the lapse of sixty or seventy years if the physiologist be correct? Should a man commit a crime in one decade how will you punish him in another if his identity be lost either to himself or others? The fact is, personal identity is no predicate of matter, but of a living, conscious spirit; and this being the case, it follows again that matter is not, never has been, nor ever will be spirit, and thus a true psychology confirms the teaching of Scripture, that "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

The foregoing arguments in proof of the essential difference between body and spirit, and in confirmation of the Bible's teaching on the science of man, are given as specimens merely of what might be said in this line of ratiocination, for clearly a distinct argument may be drawn in favor of the same conclusion by comparing, separately, all the other attributes of matter with those of mind. But enough has been said to indicate the method of discussing the point with the materialist, and that is all we aim at here.

This spirit, imparted directly by the "Father of Spirits," was given us that it might, in connection with a body fearfully and wonderfully made, love, obey, and glorify its Maker and enjoy him forever. It was the intention of God that the body should be in subjection to the spirit, and both to him, for, intuitively, appetite is below reason just as man's reason is below the will of God. By obeying the appetite of the flesh rather than the dictates of reason and the will of his Maker, Adam ruined himself and transmitted to his posterity a nature in ruins, physically and morally. By the disobedience of one, the

many were made sinners, and death became the lot of all, for all have sinned. The separation of the soul from God, not annihilation, is the Scripture idea of death. Souls are dead when under the dominion of appetite, lust, sin. Lust conceives and brings forth sin, and sin, when it does its finished work, brings forth death. It was thus in our Federal Head at the beginning, and thus it will be till the end of time. The spirit separated from God dies, and his body separated from his spirit dies also. A change of mode, not a destruction of being, is the truth that gives form and consistency to revealed religion from the fall of Adam to the resurrection of Jesus, and thence to the completed salvation of the Christian in the everlasting kingdom above. Sin and death are therefore the inexorable facts of man's natural state. They are as inseparable as the decree of Jehovah can make them; where the one is the other is; where the one is not the other is not. "The soul that sinneth shall die." Are there corroborating evidences in the natural history of our race that so direful a calamity as sin has ever passed upon this fair creation of God? Is it a poetic fiction that nature gave signs of woe when the being, made in his Father's likeness, broke the divine law and brought death and all our woe into the world? Is it not rather a sorrowful truth attested by the groans, the tears, and dying agonies of the whole creation that travails in pain until now? Were it not so, how shall we account for the wide-spread expectation and hope of a Redeemer? The sacrifices upon Gentile altars looking back to an apostasy from God, seeking to propitiate his favor, and pointing to the coming One who was to remove sin by the sacrifice of himself, do but express, darkly it is true, and all imperfectly, but still most touchingly, the deep-seated longing of the human heart for a restoration of the soul's union with the Infinite. The soul is indeed in ruins, yet the fragments sparkle in the dust, and in the eye and heart of God they are of more value than all else besides.

It is only as we attain a correct view of the heinous nature of sin, and the ruin it has wrought in the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, and through these to the whole creation, that the mission of God's own Son into the world can be made consistent with the attributes of the Divine Mind, and credible to our understandings. Because we are partakers of flesh and blood it behooved Christ to take part of the same, that through death he might destroy him who has the power



of death, and deliver us who were all our life-time subject to bondage. Who shall say, looking at the divine origin of man so worthy of that origin in the powers and susceptibilities of his twofold nature; at the almost infinite treasures of thought, feeling, and action in his mind and heart; at the expenditure of means to make the world a suitable residence for him; and above all, at the love, and mercy, and goodness of the Father of the whole family in heaven and earth, that the redemption of man from sin and death was not a thought worthy of God in every view we can take of his adorable character? When our creation in body and spirit by the omnipotent power of God, our fall through sin and consequent subjection to death, our restoration by Christ through his assumption of our nature, and his death in that nature to take away the sin of the world, and to bring eternal life to all who will accept it in him; when all these are regarded as parts of a great scheme of redemption beginning with the birth of time, and to be consummated in eternity, the whole will appear most consistent with our highest conceptions of divine wisdom and goodness. If, however, we divide these from each other, destroying the beautiful symmetry of God's most perfect work, is it any wonder we fall into darkness and doubt? All forms of naturalism and unbelief do this. They begin in the negation of a personal Deity, the fact of creation, and man's spiritual nature; they reject his apostasy, redemption by Christ, revelation and its miracles of mercy, the possibility of the soul's existing out of the body, the resurrection of that body, and end in the blackness and darkness of universal and eternal death. These horrible negations may be disguised by the hypocrisy of those who promulgate them under the name of philosophy and religion, or they may be entertained as a refuge from half-awakened fears; it matters not, they end in death.

Redemption is a scheme which, to be understood and appreciated, must be viewed both analytically and synthetically. As in all true method we make our analysis that we may the better conduct our synthesis, so here, we must divide the compound whole into its logical parts, give to each its proper place and relative value, and state to our own minds, clearly and distinctly, the true relation of part to part, and all the parts to the reconstructed whole. In no other way can nature be successfully studied; and as redemption is a system as much as nature, it, too, must be investigated in obedience to these self-evident

principles. Its laws and ordinances are as definitely related to our present and future being as are the laws and forces of nature to all the complicated movements of the universe. The chief reason why we do not perceive this is, that in religion the agencies employed are, from the nature of the case, more occult and subtle, while the mystery to be solved is infinitely more complex. This being the difficulty, many, from incomplete inductions and a vicious method, have formed one-sided views, as may be demonstrated by an examination of the contradictory theologies claiming the authority of Scripture and adaptation to the nature of man. Had their authors collected the facts of divine revelation, and then proceeded in harmony with a true anthropology, it would have been better for themselves, the Church, and the world.

A properly constructed science of man will, then, prepare us to accept the Gospel, however much its truths may transcend the finite. All we need is to be assured that what is revealed is according to the will of God, and faith accepts it lovingly. False philosophies of our nature keep multitudes from Christ, and among these none more than those about the human spirit, and its relation to the body.

Man being composed of body and spirit in one mysterious entity, it ought not to appear strange to any one acquainted with the mere elements of mental and physiological science, that it has pleased God to save the spirit through the body, and not independently of it. Is the reason of man to be reached in order to Scriptural faith? The testimony which alone can produce it is to be submitted to his understanding, just as in any other case. The things done by God in creation, by Christ in redemption, and by the Holy Spirit in sanctification are in the Scriptures proposed as facts to be apprehended by the understanding, and being understood, they are offered, on the divine testimony, to our faith; grasped by this last, they descend, so to speak, into our hearts in their transforming power. Our whole moral nature is thus brought under the influence of the Gospel, which is the power of God for our salvation. Truly, "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God," and when faith comes, true Scripture faith, leading its now enlightened subject to trust in the Cross, and in it alone, all comes—a spirit of joyful obedience, justification, adoption into the family of God, and ultimate salvation in the everlasting kingdom. The mind and heart being thus purged of the fallacies and

corruptions of sin, the body as well becomes an instrument of righteousness. The apprehension of the enlightened understanding, the consent of the reason, and the love of the heart are all called forth from the tongue when the penitent soul confesses before God, angels, and men that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God and the Savior of the world. So much for the spirit. See now that spirit presenting, as it were, its body too, a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, in the laver of regeneration. Truly, "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation," and "We are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."

The spirit, thus brought to and continuing in Christ, dies no more. It *has* eternal life, and even to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord. We have seen that death is separation. The believer is separated from his sins in baptism, and is hence dead to sin, but the same grace that made him dead to sin made him alive to God, and he dies no more; death hath no more power over him. While, however, his spiritual nature is in union with Christ, "the quickening spirit," his body, still holding a relation to the mere living soul of the first Adam, must die, but it alone dies, not the spirit, if the Bible means any thing at all, and is not a tissue of enigmas and contradictions. Space will allow only a few observations upon this, and a few cases in illustration of what must ever be one of the interesting points in our history, from birth in flesh, condemnation through sin, regeneration by a birth of water and spirit, the separation of the spirit from the body, and the consequent death of the latter, till its resurrection and glorious change, that it may be forever the tabernacle of that spirit in the presence of God.

Does, then, the spirit die; cease its conscious existence at the death of the body? Of whom shall we ask this momentous question? Shall it be the mere philosopher? His mind, and heart, and lip are a sealed sepulcher, at whose door no angels stand to ask, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" Shall we go to the materialist, no Savior to say, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise?" Since these false anthropologies can give us neither light, nor life, nor comfort in the hour of our dissolution, let us hear the voice of prophets and apostles speaking by the inspiration of the Almighty,

and all will be well. If science can not answer us satisfactorily, neither can it contravene the truth. The idea is above, not against reason. That the teachings of Scripture in regard to the intermediate state are not contrary to reason may be shown by many entirely independent methods of proof, and this is no small confirmation of our belief that both the doctrine is true, and that the common interpretation of those texts which refer to that state is the correct one. If the human spirit be immaterial, as is shown by a comparison of the properties of matter and spirit, it may be shown, *a priori*, probable that spirit is indestructible. The spirit is a simple, uncompounded, and indivisible essence, and if reduced to non-existence it must be by the power that brought it into being, that is, by the power of God, or its destruction must result from the operation of the laws of its own being. Before it can be shown to be by the former it must be shown that the Almighty ever reduces any thing he has created to nonentity. It can not be shown that this is the case, even with matter, much less will it ever be done in the case of spiritual essences. Changes of form and of mode we see on every hand, but the annihilation of any thing has no place in reason or science any more than in Scripture. Changes in the form of matter, to the eye of the uneducated, seem like its destruction, but the uniform testimony of science is that this is a mistake; and so the departure—for that is all it is—of the soul from its tenement at death seems to be its destruction; for the only way, independently of revelation, that we can know spirit at all, even our own, is by its attributes of thinking, willing, reasoning, etc., and where we do not see these manifested we infer destruction. There is nothing, secondly, in the nature of spirit itself to lead us to suppose that the spirit is destructible. That it is so can, therefore, be only a conjecture, and allowing the contrary to be nothing more, it remains to be seen which is the more probable in view of other and independent considerations.

Now, when we consider that the desire of every sane mind is for life and not for death; that by most acute thinkers this "longing after immortality" is regarded as an intuition; that the almost universal opinion of mankind in all ages, climes, and stages of intellectual culture; that Egyptians, Persians, Phœnicians, Assyrians, Celts, Goths, and Indians, in fact, all peoples, and, above all, that Jews and Christians, ancient and modern, having from the beginning the ora-

cles of truth, have believed that the spirit continues in a conscious state after the death of the body—when all this, we say, is on the side of one of these equal probabilities, with very little on the other to counterbalance it, the judgment of reason must ever be that it is true. The prevailing sentiment of the civilized world, through all the ages of recorded history, has been that when the spirit leaves the body it goes into the place of departed spirits, the virtuous to be happy, the vicious to be miserable; and that this is the doctrine of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures it is hardly necessary to prove to those who accept them as true. An examination of the use of the word *sheol* in the former and of *hades* in the latter will satisfy any one of this who has no unscriptural theory of the intermediate state to support. Hades, the Greek word for this intermediate state, is found eleven times in the New Testament, and is rendered into English by the term "hell" in every case except one, where it is translated *grave*. That neither hell nor grave is a proper rendering of the word is, we believe, now conceded by the scholarship of the world.

We have a shorter and a better way of setting forth the truth of our position than by dwelling on the etymology of the word, or its usage in classical and sacred writings, though this is well enough in its place. It is to cite a few examples, out of many that occur in the Bible, which place the actual existence of such a state beyond reasonable doubt. In Deut. xviii, 10, 11, we have this explicit testimony: "There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or necromancer. For all that do such things are an abomination to the Lord." A necromancer is one who foretells the future by holding intercourse with the dead. That there were such among the Jews in the days of Moses is evident from the circumstance that he published this severe law against them, even if there was no other testimony to the fact. We can not reconcile it with our ideas of God that he should have legislated thus through the Jewish lawgiver had there been no possibility of man's consulting departed spirits. In the case of the woman of Endor, recorded 1 Sam. xxviii, 15, we have a somewhat circumstantial account of such consultation; and though we may not be able to comprehend all that

is detailed, this much is certain, that just as surely as that the Bible is true Saul held converse with the disquieted spirit of the deceased prophet, and received from him a revelation of his approaching death on the bloody field of Gilboa. "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me," said Samuel, and they went to him, or there is neither truth nor consistency in the record.

If we open the New Testament cases multiply to place the matter beyond all question. In Peter's discourse on the first Pentecost, quoting the sixteenth Psalm, he says the soul of Christ was not left in *hades*—for that is the word—neither did his flesh see corruption. Jesus himself had said to the penitent robber, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." The language is plain, and warrants us in saying that the spirit of Jesus and the spirit of the robber went, after their death on the cross, to a place called paradise. No one will say their bodies met there, and it is clear they did not go to heaven. If to these we add the declaration of Paul in 2 Cor. xii, 4, that he—in the body or out of the body, he could not tell—was caught up to paradise, the case of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi, 22, and the language of the proto-martyr Stephen, in *articulo mortis*, we have as much as may be necessary to give the reader an idea of what might be said to place it beyond all question that an intermediate state is recognized in the Scriptures. It is painful to one who loves the Word of God to see how some men attempt to set aside these passages.

After the Savior had tarried among the spirits in *hades* some forty hours, we are informed he returned, and resuming his mangled body he rose triumphantly from the dead, and thus shed light on life and immortality. Then our nature rose in him who was bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. To doubt this transcendent fact is to doubt all; to accept it as the crowning event in the mission of Christ, and the earnest of our own resurrection, is to exchange the doubts, and fears, and gloom of death for the life and blessedness of heaven. The historic evidence of this greatest of all the miracles of Christ has been in the hands of men since that morn of hope to a sinful world till the present; millions have examined it, and found it true, and have rejoiced in it with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

A science of man that would leave out of view the fact that these bodies, fashioned so finely by the hand of Infinite Wisdom, are to be



raised from the charnel-house, deserves not the name, and will never satisfy the demands of reason, or the longings of the heart. The Bible holds up before the thought of the world the "man" Christ Jesus, the incarnation of the "logos," as the model of our life, our nature, our duty, our destiny. If we be in him, and are living a true life, we shall be conformed to his image now and hereafter. That is the restored image of God, and in it is found our perfected humanity.

In this materialistic age, tending to the denial of miracles and the supernatural, it behooves all men to review the ground of their faith and hope; for, however well founded these may be they are sure to be jostled somewhat by the conflicts of opinion going on everywhere. Nothing of any importance in physics, science, or morals escapes the scrutiny of men, and did they bring to the examination of things, material and spiritual, a truly devout and philosophical mind, all would be well. Instead of this, however, very many appear to think that reason has left nothing for revelation, nor science any thing for faith; that all things are to be known by observation and experiment, save, perhaps, the apodictic sciences of logic and mathematics.

The whole ground of controversy as respects religion has, of late, been changed. The rationalism of Germany, France, England, as well as of our own country, has rendered useless much that the fathers have written in answer to the objections of former times. Just as in the art of war the arms and engines of this century have made worthless the arrows, and spears, and catapults of the ancients, so that he would be laughed at who should now enter battle furnished with these, in like manner would the theologian expose himself to ridicule who should now attempt the defense of Christianity with the arguments that were so potent against Julian, Celsus, and Porphyry, or in later times, Paine, Volney, and Voltaire. We must be ready to advance our lines into the enemy's country, and while we fortify well the ground already won, we must storm his strongholds and spike his guns even in his intrenchments. This is no easy task when such thinkers as Strauss, Rénan, and Parker are at their posts, to say nothing of the whole army of rationalists and freethinkers under their command.

Of one thing the Church has reason to be proud: she has fought and won the battle over the historical evidences in favor of the

Gospel, and this, strengthened by the toils of such evangelical scholars as Neander, Gieseler, Milman, Stanley, Schaff, and a host like them, serves as a base of operations for the grand army that is now marshaling for the new encounter. Few opposers of the Gospel now, who have any pretensions to scholarship in history or its philosophy, call in question the historic truth of the New Testament. All modern rationalists of note concede, with Strauss, Rénan, and the rest, that what may be called the *natural* in the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John is worthy of credit. "As little," says Strauss, "as humanity will ever be without religion, as little will it be without Christ. For to have religion without Christ would be as absurd as to enjoy poetry without regard to Homer or Shakspeare. And this Christ is *historical*, not mythical; is an individual, not a mere symbol. To the historical person of Christ belongs all in his life that exhibits his religious perfection, his discourses, his moral action, and his passion. He remains the highest model of religion within the reach of our thought, and no perfect piety is possible without his presence in the heart."

This may be taken as embodying the mature view of the better school of rationalists, and we may be sure it has been conceded only because it could not be denied. Though for different reasons they admit as fully as ever did Celsus, all the essential facts recorded in the Evangelists, as far as it may be done without granting a miraculous element.

There is another ground of evidence for the authenticity of the Gospel that has been yielded by the enemy. It is the proof that results from its perfect adaptation to man as man, and its power to raise him individually and nationally to the highest attainable perfection. The question in this respect is really between Christianity and no religion at all. Except a few Jews, no one in Christendom thinks of a rival to our religion; so that here again we have occupation, and all we have to do is to fortify. The historical, and what we may call the ethical, are, then, secure. It remains that we fight the skepticism of the age on the miraculous phase. Many may think, and do think, that having the historical and the ethical, we may decline the contest about the miraculous; but such believers are short-sighted and timid. All truth is harmonious if only we have diligence, patience, and reverence enough to discover it. With these and a

correct method in which to carry forward our investigations, remembering that it is the revealed things of God that offer themselves to our thought, we may as surely come to the truth that makes us free through the examination of what is supernatural as in any other way.

Of one thing we are profoundly convinced—that Christ and the apostles based their claim to the faith of the world upon miracles, and that the greatest of all these was his resurrection from the dead. Believe me for my work's sake, is the appeal of Jesus from the first miracle at Cana of Galilee, till he rose out of the sealed sepulcher, and, in the presence of the apostles, ascended to heaven. Neither were these latter a whit behind him in this respect. They were to bear witness to his resurrection, and in proof thereof, were to perform signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds; thus, "with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." If the miracles of the New Testament can not be made credible, neither can be the religion in whose support they were wrought; and if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not raised, the apostles were false witnesses of God, we are yet in our sins, and they who sleep are perished. Such is the reasoning of Paul, and who is a better logician than he?

We must, then, with the historical and the ethical secured, advance to meet the skeptical scientist and the rationalist on their chosen line of defense, and this carried, the war is ended. It is encouraging to our faith that God is raising up men every-where competent to grapple with the champions of unbelief on the great problems that lie at the root of the whole matter. If there are many scientists seeking to reduce all things to the sphere of the material, and to formulate even thought and its laws, spirit and its manifestations, and even God himself in equations of matter and its forces, mechanical and physiological, it is equally true that never since time began have there been as many able minds enlisted in the defense of our holy religion as at the present.

If it can be established that the body of Jesus did actually rise from the dead, it seems to us that as surely as the greater includes the less, all discussion as to the verity of the Christian religion is at an end. We are confident that as true science advances, no matter into what department of human investigation it may be pushed, it will be found to be more and more in harmony with religion, so far

as they can be compared. If the natural be presented to our reason, and the supernatural revealed to our faith, then, if it can be shown that reason and faith are in agreement so far forth as they are related, it will follow that the natural and supernatural, so far from antagonizing, will be the complements of each other. They both in loving accord form one system of God. Matter and mind, the natural and the spiritual, the earthly and the heavenly; the living soul of the first Adam and the quickening spirit of the second, are alike from him who is as well the former of our bodies as the Father of our spirits.

It is sad to think that the Christian religion having even in its corrupted form, brought the world up to its present stage of civilization and culture by fostering all that is productive of good to the race, should have her benefactions used to weaken the faith of her children, and draw them away from her guidance to the deceptive lights of a false philosophy. Materialism finds no support in the immortal hopes the Gospel holds out to all who obey it; and we hope the day is at hand when it shall find none in the well-attested principles of a rational Anthropology.

## V.—THE CHRIST OF HISTORY THE CHRIST OF PROPHECY.

“THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IS THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY.”

THE moral miracle of God dwelling with men is the grandest proposition in the universe. The Bible is the garniture of heaven. Christ is the soul of the Bible. Expel the person of Christ from the Bible and nothing remains but a wilted foliage. Remove the knowledge of Christ from the world, and nothing is left for the mental eye to rest upon but a track of moral desolation. Remove the types of Christ from the law, the soul of Christ from the Psalms, and the person and character of Christ from the prophecies, and you have nothing but dead leaves left in the reading of the Old Testament. Expel Christ from the New Testament, as a living and divine personage, and you shall have nothing to contemplate save the drapery of a mystic palace—the frail scaffolding of a desolate temple. Let the skeptic, in imagination, burn up every Bible in the land, pull down every pulpit where Christ is preached, banish every preacher of the Gospel from the earth, extract the name of Christ from all literature, expunge from all civil law and jurisprudence the knowledge of Immanuel, dissipate the spirit of Christ from all educational institutions, and destroy every asylum established upon the principles of Christ's philanthropy, and what were the moral and spiritual status of the human family? The first chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Church at Rome will furnish a substantial answer to this question; to which suggestive chapter we trust the atheist, and deist, and pantheist will turn and read. It has always been a wonder to us why infidels, who hate the Bible, and deny Christ, and despise the Church, with all its collateral institutions, do not emigrate to a country congenial to their tastes, where all divine institutions are absent, and there luxuriate in heathen idolatry, and in the midst of fearful orgies and horrid blasphemies, close their eventful lives in the demoniacal dance of death. There they could buy land at a shilling an acre, and drink human blood from cups made out of the skulls of captured cannibals, all of whom seem to get along, in some shape, without the Bible,

without Christ, without the Gospel, and without Christian institutions. We advise all confirmed infidels to migrate heathenward.

The presence of Christ, whether viewed as Prophet, Priest, and King, or as God-man, Propitiation, Sacrifice, Savior, Mediator, and final Judge, pervades the entire Bible. He is photographed as THE DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS; and through Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob down to the illustrious David, and thence to Isaiah, he is graphically represented as the Serpent-Bruiser, as the Ancient of the Ages, King of Zion, the Messiah, the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, Wonderful Counselor, the Prince of Peace, the Mighty God, the Star of Jacob, etc. He is symbolized in the brazen serpent as the Healer of the people; he is symbolized in the daily sacrifices, and in the temple service, as the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world; he is represented as a great Prophet and Lawgiver; his atoning death, his triumph over the grave and Satan, his obscure birth and his glorious entrance into heaven, the subjugation of all nations and the complete and universal establishment of his kingdom over all the earth; all these wondrous events glow and glisten upon the pages of inspiration as living and undeniable realities. The image of Christ is reflected upon every page of the Hebrew Scriptures. Every successive step of the divine scheme is irradiated by the presence of the Logos.

Rationalists of every school find their greatest difficulty in trying to destroy the harmony that exists between the Christ of prophecy and the Christ of history. This moral miracle they never can batter down, neither by casuistry, sophistry, ridicule, or sarcasm. The impression of this irreversible miracle of power—the coincident fulfillment of all the prophecies in the life and character of Christ—is ineffaceably written upon the hearts of the people. Well that it is, for Christ is the only hope of the world.

In Luke i, 26-33, is recorded the announcement to Mary of the birth of a remarkable Son: "And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came to her and said, Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women. . . And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS. He shall



be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." The prediction is found in Isaiah vii, 14-16: "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name IMMANUEL. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings." In this chapter we find deliverance promised to Ahaz, which is also typical of salvation through the promised Messiah: "The king of Judah and the royal family being in the uttermost consternation," on account of the invasion of their country by Rezin and Pekah, the kings of Syria and Israel (see 2 Kings xvi, 5-7) on this occasion the prophet is sent to assure them that God would verify his promises to David and his house; so that, although they might be corrected, they should not be destroyed while these remained to be accomplished. This subject is discussed in the seventh and eighth chapters, beginning with the ninth. The seventh chapter opens with an account of the occasion of the prophecy, followed by a prediction of the misfortunes of the Israelites and Syrians against Judah. The particular period in which Ephraim (or Israel) should cease to be a nation, is foretold in the eighth verse (in 65 years) when this prophecy was accurately fulfilled and punctually consummated by the entire depopulation of their country by Esar-haddon, who swept away whatever had been left by former conquerors. From this period, the ten tribes were confounded with the people of Judah in the great captivity; since which time they have, in common with the people of Judah, borne the general name of Jews. The period here referred to being, however, removed to the distance of more than sixty years, the king presumes to ask a miracle, as Gideon had formerly done (Judges vi, 36-42), and as Hezekiah did afterward (2 Kings xx, 8-11) in assurance of immediate deliverance; but Ahaz not having confidence in the prophet, nor in God, declines this favor under a pretense of modesty, though in fact, as his character clearly demonstrates, from a principle of unbelief.

The prophet then addresses himself not to Ahaz personally, but to the house and family of David, and delivers what may be justly

called (as it is by Chandler and Hurd) a *typical* prophecy of the Messiah: "A virgin shall conceive," etc. Lowth renders this in the present tense, *conceiveth* and *beareth*, which we can only permit on the principle of the prophetic spirit realizing events yet to come, and representing things future as though they were actually present. It is conceded, however, that the words *might* have a primary allusion to some betrothed virgin that should now prove pregnant of a son, and before "this boy" should come to years of distinguishing "good and evil" the invaders should be destroyed, and peace and plenty for a time restored. But we invite the particular attention of skeptics, and rationalists, and positivists to the singular and extraordinary fulfillment of the special prophecy relating to that distinguished personage, who should be "born of a virgin," 742 years after the prediction, in the land of Judea, and who, in the very sequel of this prophecy, (viii, 8,) is characterized as Lord, or Prince of the land of Judah. It must also be borne in mind that it is the style of this prophet to connect temporal and spiritual deliverances together, and that frequently the view of the latter rushing powerfully on his mind absorbs, as it were, the former.\*

No one dares to dispute that there was such a character as John, the harbinger of the Messiah, of whom it was foretold by Malachi that he should come in the spirit and power of the prophet Elijah. In boldness of spirit, in conscientiousness, in habits of life approaching to asceticism, and in defiance of the threats of kings and the frowns of priests John was the counterpart of the magisterial Elijah. John's special mission, in the sublime drama of human redemption, was to go before the face of the Lord and prepare a people for the coming king. The Jews being divided into many sects, consequent upon which there were many bitter family feuds, which personal animosities also among kindred had superinduced national demoralization, John, in exact fulfillment of the prophecy, came in advance of the great Messiah, "to turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers." No one can gainsay the fact that John turned many of the disaffected Jews to the Lord, at the same time, as his own glory was declining, pointing them to the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world.

\*See Lowth's Isaiah, Chandler's Defense of Christianity, Hurd on the Prophecies, and Dr. J. P. Smith's Messiah.

At the birth of John, Zacharias, his father, being filled with the Holy Spirit, sang in prophetic strains of "the Prophet of the Highest:" "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people. And he hath raised up a horn of salvation for us, in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, who have been since the world began; that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant, the oath which he swore to our father Abraham, that he would grant to us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. And thou, child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord, to prepare his way; to give knowledge of salvation to his people, by the remission of their sins, through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace." Luke i, 68-70. These historical facts are undeniable and irrefutable.

Christ was born in Bethlehem of Judea. Was this singular fact predicted? When, and by whom? The Sanhedrim, in answer to Herod, concerning the birth of the Savior, replied: "For thus it is written by the prophet (Micah): And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not least among the princes of Judah; for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel." Matt. ii, 5, 6. The place of the birth of Jesus is undisputed. Micah, 710 B. C., thus announced the place where Jesus should be born: "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall come forth to me that is to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." Micah v, 2. *Bethlehem* is literally the place of bread, and it was called Ephratah from its proximity to Ephrath (Gen. xlviii, 7), and of Judah, to distinguish it from a town less considerable in the tribe of Naphtali. In the two quotations there is an apparent contradiction; for while in the prediction it reads, ("Though) thou be little," in the answer of the chief priests it reads, "thou art *not* least." Both assertions, however, are not only true, but entirely accurate. Bethlehem, as a city, was never extensive nor populous, compared with

Jerusalem; yet it ranked high as the birthplace of King David, as the predicted birthplace of the Messiah, and also from the fact that it was fixed upon by the Romans where all the tribes of Judah should be enrolled.

The visit of the "wise men" to the babe of Bethlehem was the fulfillment of a remarkable prediction. The representative word in the original for wise men is *magoi*, from which is derived our word *magician*, now used in a bad sense, but not so in the original. In Matthew ii, 1, 2, the reading is: "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him." Balaam, the son of Beor, a heathen prophet of the land of Moab, speaking by the inspiration of God, and overlooking the tents of Israel as they spread out in the valley beneath, gave utterance to these most significant words fourteen hundred and fifty-one years before Christ: "*I shall see him, but not now: I shall behold him, but not nigh: There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Seth.*" Numb. xxiv, 17.

Rabbi Maimonides explains these words thus:

"'I shall see him, but not now,' this is *David*. 'I shall behold him, but not nigh;' this is King *Messiah*. 'A star shall arise out of Jacob;' this is *David*; 'and a scepter shall arise out of Israel;' this is King *Messiah*. 'He shall smite all the corners of Moab;' this is *David*; 'and destroy all the children of Seth;' this is King *Messiah*."

This extract (given by Ainsworth) is sufficient to show that the most learned Jews of former times found it necessary to apply this prophecy in part to the Messiah. Christian interpreters (Bishop Newton in particular) regard it as a double prophecy, referring, in the first instance, to David, and in the second, but chief, to his greater Son, Messiah. The introductory sentence, "*I shall see him,*" etc., the learned author just quoted, with many others, interprets in the present tense of the prophet discerning by the spirit of prophecy, events yet future, with the same certainty as if they were present; though he was sensible that he was speaking of events yet "a long time to come." Some practical commentators give also the words a reference to the second coming of King Messiah "in the clouds of

heaven," when "every eye shall see him;" though many, to their own sorrow, at an awful distance. Rev. i, 7.

The star and scepter, the symbols of divine and sovereign power, point manifestly to him who was "the root and offspring of David," "the bright morning star, the prince of the kings of the earth." Rev. xxii, 16. The prediction, as respects Moab, however, has evidently a reference to the victories of David over this country when he smote Moab, "casting them down to the ground." 2 Sam. viii, 2. But even this part of the prophecy does not seem to terminate in David; Moab often being used as a term for idolaters and enemies to God, his victories may adumbrate the final triumphs of David's Son and Lord.

With this undeniable testimony before us, with much more that could be gathered, it is easy to be seen why "wise men" from Arabia and Persia, attracted by the prophetic and phenomenal star, eagerly repaired to Bethlehem. These *magi* were philosophers, priests, and astronomers. They were the learned men of the Eastern nations, devoted to the science of astronomy, to religion, and to medicine. They were held in high esteem by the Persian court, were admitted as counselors, and followed the camps in war to give advice; consequently, the remarkable prophecy of Balaam must have been known by them. Besides the foregoing considerations, the fact is patent, that many Jews, at that time, dwelt in Egypt, in Rome, and in Greece; many, also, had gone to Eastern countries, and in every place they carried their Scriptures, spreading abroad the expectation that some remarkable personage was about to make his advent. The Jews were anxiously anticipating the coming of the Messiah. By computing the time mentioned by Daniel (ch. ix, 25-27) they knew the period was approaching when the Shiloh should appear. They supposed this wonderful personage would come as a temporal prince, and they were fondly expecting that he would deliver them from the galling chains of Roman bondage. Hence, it was quite natural that the expectation should spread into other countries.

When Jesus was baptized in Jordan "the heavens were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him." Matt. iii, 16. This was the inauguration of his personal ministry, graphically depicted by the evangelical prophet (Isa. lxi, 1-3) in these words: "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon

me ; because the Lord has anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek ; he has sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound ; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the vengeance of our God ; to comfort all that mourn ; to appoint to them that mourn in Zion, to give to them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness ; that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified." These same words of prophecy, clearly indicating the life-work of the great Benefactor, were substantially quoted by the Savior himself, when, immediately after his temptation, he went into the synagogue of Nazareth on the Sabbath day, as was his custom, to read from the law and the prophets. We doubt not the reading of the Scriptures was by Divine appointment, and the custom of expounding them may be traced up to the time of Ezra. Neh. viii, 8. According to Dr. Gill, seven persons read every Sabbath day ; namely, a priest, a Levite, and five Israelites of other tribes. On these occasions the *chuzan*, or minister, delivered the sacred book to the person who stood up to read, and after reading a certain portion he returned the book ; and if he proposed to expound or preach, he sat down in the desk in which he read, as the Lord did in the present instance. The people understood this, and, therefore, as soon as Jesus was seated, "the eyes of all were fastened upon him." The people were all attention and admiration, for never man spake as this man. They "bare testimony" to his rare ability as a teacher, and even wondered at "the words of grace" to which he gave utterance ; by which speech we understand, not only his graceful elocution, but also the gracious and delightful truths which he delivered ; so that they exclaimed, "*Is not this the son of Joseph ?*" Luke iv, 22. And upon another, if not on this occasion, the people are led to inquire, wonderingly, "*Whence has this man this wisdom ?*"

Jesus of Nazareth, in every sentiment he uttered, in every act he represented, and in the illustration by his own example of every truth he announced, stands without a parallel in the history of the world—stands unrivaled by the majesty of his morality, by the nobility of his unsullied soul, by the ponderous weight of his soul-piercing words, by the self-consciousness of authoritative power, by intuitive knowledge of which the philosophical world never dreamed. Without



the aid of books ; without the privilege of school or seminary ; without the experience of foreign travel and association with leading minds ; without wealth, or celebrity, or prestige, and an entire stranger to the wisdom of Carthaginians, Greeks, and Romans, we nevertheless find this son of a poor carpenter disputing, at the age of twelve, with the erudite doctors of the great Jewish Sanhedrim, and utterly confounding them by the profundity of his unanswerable questions and unexpected answers. Never having learned the law, he quotes with singular accuracy from the law ; never having studied the prophecies, he cites and applies them with a precision at once inexplicable and startling to the Jews. Never having examined the records of history, he introduces facts and cites testimonies which only the highly educated could perform. Wholly unacquainted with the origin and propagation of the religious systems of his day, outside of what little he had learned of his mother's religion, he could instantaneously plunge into the deepest depths of all known theologies, expose their false foundations, detect their glossed sophisms, and penetrate the transparent motive of every religionist. *The knowledge of all things in the universe, both of mind and matter, was ever present with him.* No matter where found, what the emergency or circumstance—in the society of friends, in the presence of danger, or in the hands of his persecutors—he never was known to be out of equipoise.

One striking feature in the life of Christ, pertinent to him alone as the founder of a universal kingdom, is thus set forth by Isaiah (xlii, 1-4) : "Behold my servant [or servant Messiah, as it is in the Chaldee] whom I uphold ; mine elect, in whom my soul delights ; I have put my spirit upon him ; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor raise a clamor in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax he shall not quench ; he shall bring forth judgment to truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth : and the isles shall wait for his law." The evident meaning of this is, that, unlike other kings who had preceded him, he should not raise a sedition, or attempt to excite tumult in any civil government, and in which respect *the Christ* was eminently distinguished from all the false Messiahs known in history. All earthly kingdoms are established by the sword, and their foundations cemented together by the blood of the innocent and helpless. But Christ would found his

kingdom upon LOVE, which again finds no parallel in the annals of time. The zeal of the Lord's house would consume all his time and energies. He would interfere in the affairs of no civil government; he would advance no political sentiments which should raise a tumult among the people; he would suggest no hints touching upon commercial enterprises; he would not project a system of finances; he would not erect literary and scientific institutions; nor would he indicate the best manner of sustaining armies or navies. At this stage of our investigation, we are inclined to ask the positivist, Who was this singular personage—a mere man, or IMMANUEL?

The incarnation of the Messiah is promised under the splendid image of the rising sun—"the Sun of Righteousness"—when he arises "with healing under his wings," dissipating the shades, and gloom, and damps of night, and spreading light, and joy, and health around. The metaphor is grand beyond all description. Mr. Robinson, formerly of Cambridge, mentions the following circumstance: Every morning he was told, about sunrise, in the Levant (especially at Smyrna) a fresh gale of wind blows from the sea across the land, which, from its utility in clearing the infected air, is called the *Doctor*. "Now," says Mr. Robinson, "it strikes me that the prophet Malachi, who lived in that quarter of the world, might allude to this circumstance when he says the Sun of Righteousness shall arise with healing in his wings."\*

All the predictions so far cited can only apply to Christ. The personage never has been found to whom they can apply. Read the Sermon on the Mount, and then read the following from Isaiah xi, 1-9, and mark the beautiful correspondence: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord; and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears. But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod [or blast] of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of

\* "Oriental Customs," No. 367.

his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

"The Greek and Latin poets," says Dr. J. Smith, "have painted their *golden age* in very beautiful colors, but the exquisite imagery of Isaiah stands unequaled and inimitable. It is hardly necessary to observe, that these figurative expressions of the prophet denote the power of the Gospel in changing the hearts, tempers, and lives of the worst of men. Of this happy power there has been, in every age, a cloud of witnesses, although its most glorious era, predicted here, may not yet have arrived. The latter part of the chapter, in which there are many beautiful allusions to the Exodus from Egypt, seems to refer principally to the future restoration of the Jews from their several dispersions, and to that happy period when they and the Gentiles shall stand together under the banner of Jesus, and unite their zeal in extending the limits of his kingdom."

At the birth of the Savior, "the angel of the Lord" announced to the shepherds, "*Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, AMONG MEN OF GOOD PLEASURE.*"\* Who but Christ ever originated the idea of establishing and extending a kingdom by the silent workings of the principle of love? and this love producing peace? Wherever the words of Christ are received, and entertained, and pondered upon, they work peace to the individual heart, peace to the family, and peace and prosperity to the nation. If his words are interfered with, where hearts are ready to receive them, they shall produce a sword of fire that shall pierce the opposers of the Peace-maker through and through. To whom can we apply the following brilliant strains of prophecy but to the Lord's Messiah? "For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder, and his name shall be called *Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.* Of the increase of his government there

\* "Baxter's Critical English New Testament."

shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." Isa. ix, 5-7. The first verse of this chapter should not be separated from the close of the preceding, to the subject-matter of which it properly belongs. In the preceding chapter the unbelieving Jews, who stubbornly rejected the counsels of God, and even spurned the promise of the Messiah, are represented as plunging deeper and deeper into gloom and national demoralization (the *denationalizing* of the Jews and their consequent dispersion to the four quarters of the earth being in itself a moral miracle, which, to the rationalist, still remains an unsolved question). See Jer. ch. xxx. In the eighth chapter of Isaiah, which we are at present contemplating, there springs up to the Jews the dawn of better days, even in those sections most sorely afflicted by the invasion of Tiglath-pileser, namely, "the lands of Zebulun and Naphtali, and that part of Galilee beyond Jordan." 2 Kings xv, 29. In this land it is predicted should arise the first dawn of salvation by the glorious Messiah. Here Jesus of Nazareth, accordingly, began his eventful public ministry. Here the "Sun of Righteousness" sublimely and refulgently arose, and spread his healing influences like the morning light, first over the fair fields of Judea, and thence throughout the Gentile world. The success of this Prince of Peace, in the gradual and imperceptible establishment of peace, and truth, and justice, all over the face of the earth, was to be consummated, not by "the battle of the warriors," but by the wonderful incarnation of the "Everlasting Father."

Was he not, indeed, the "wonderful" personage in the days of his mysterious incarnation? for, even by the testimony of his own enemies, "he spake as no man ever spake." He uttered sentiments that never, in all the preceding ages, had thrilled the human heart. The heathen philosopher and poet, "sitting in the shadow of death," could institute inquiries like these: Whence these pleasing hopes? these fond desires? this longing after immortality? Why shrinks the soul back upon herself, and startles at destruction? A vague response comes back: Ah! it is the divinity that burns within us, and *intimates* to man a glorious and fearful eternity! A mere intimation! But Christ reveals the transcendent fact, and by a mighty upheaval of the graves of the dead brings life and immortality to light. Was

he not "the mighty God," when, by the voice of his authority, he hushed the tempestuous sea to silence, so that, startled by so strange a phenomenon, the people, as if standing in the presence of a God, cry out, "What word is this that we hear, that even the winds and the sea obey him?" This incarnate God, gazing upon the full foliage of a fruitless fig-tree, by the word of his power, which rises in sublime grandeur above all the oracles of the ages, portentously declares, "Henceforth let no fruit grow upon this tree," and behold! how soon it "withers away!" Demons knew that the mighty God had come down from heaven, who was found not only reversing the dicta of false philosophers, but was discovered disturbing the repose of the unrighteous dead; for, once and again, as the Holy One drew nigh, an evil spirit would "cry with a loud voice, What have I to do with thee, JESUS, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee, by God, that thou torment me not!" Mark v, 7.

As "COUNSELOR" among men, was he ever known to commit a blunder, or fail to answer any question affecting the welfare of a sorrowing world? He was perfectly adapted to every emergency. In all his reproofs and advice, in all his expostulations and warnings, in all the blessings he conferred upon the helpless poor, and in all the joy and hope he excited in the breasts of those who hung upon his words, there was a perfect fitness of things, the highest possible sense of propriety; no improvement could, in any possible way, be suggested. Let the skeptic find a parallel in the history of the world.

As "THE EVERLASTING FATHER," (or "the Father of the future age"—the Christian dispensation,) he is loved and adored by millions of the redeemed of earth, who call upon him night and day for help, and strength, and salvation, for guidance, and wisdom, and power to do good; even, as in the days of his humble incarnation, the hungry cried for bread, and he gave them bread; as the blind prayed for sight, and he gave them sight; as the deaf plead for the gift of hearing, and he made them hear; as the leper cried to be healed, and the Good Physician healed them.

As "THE PRINCE OF PEACE," he reigns in the hearts of his subjects in a manner that never characterized any ruler of men since the world began. In the armies of the world men only fight when their generals and chieftains are present in person to give command, and to direct. Inspired by the conscious nearness of skillful generals, the

light of whose eyes speaks high approbation, and the magnetism of whose voices thrills with lofty animation, soldiers will rush forward and perform mighty deeds of valor; but when their leaders are dead or captured, there remains no one to fight—the campaign at once ceases. Not so with the Captain of our Salvation. Myriads fight, and sacrifice, and die for him who never saw him, who never saw the flash of his eye, who never felt the touch of his hand, who never saw him stand in stately grandeur before them. His banner of peace is triumphantly borne to earth's remotest bounds, though he disappeared from the earth eighteen hundred years ago.\* We claim this as another point without a parallel.

Did Christ, in his earthly career, literally fulfill the fifth and sixth verses of the thirty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, which we here present? "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing; for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert." The Savior quoted these words to the messengers of John the Baptist, who were directed to compare them with what they saw and heard, as affording satisfactory proof of his divine mission and character. In a general sense, this chapter, in the most beautiful imagery this earth affords, represents how, by the presence and purifying power of the Gospel, "the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad; . . . the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given to it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon. . . . And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

On the Mount of Transfiguration, Matt. xvii, where, in that unique, unexampled group of representative personages, Elijah represented the patriarchal dispensation, Moses the Jewish, and Christ the Christian, an audible voice from heaven rung upon their ears: "*This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased,* HEAR HIM!" Trembling

\* It is said that a "medal, struck by Vespasian, on finishing his wars, represents the goddess Peace, holding an olive-branch in one hand, and, with a lighted torch in the other, setting fire to a heap of armor." But Christ will conquer all nations before he sets the world on fire.



under authority like this, Elijah would at once disrobe himself of the insignia of his prophetic office, and Moses would, as a lawgiver, lay down his credentials at the feet of the new-born sovereign. Moses, 1,450 years before Christ, made this astonishing prediction: "*The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; TO HIM SHALL YOU HARKEN.*" Deut. xviii, 15. Modern Jews have usually applied this prediction to Joshua, the successor of Moses, but it is manifest that it was not so understood for many years after Moses, because, in the concluding chapter of this book, written either by Joshua in the close of his life, or by Ezra when compiling the canon of the Old Testament, it is expressly said, "There arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face," etc. Moses himself makes a clear distinction at the first appointment of Joshua, in stating that instead of direct communication with the Lord, as Moses himself had, he was obliged to stand before the high-priest when he required instruction from the Almighty. Num. xxvii, 21. Furthermore, Moses alone was honored in the delivery of a code of laws, besides which, also, he was the mediator of the Sinaitic covenant. All these considerations unmistakably point to the Messiah as the great prophet, as mentioned by Moses. Both Peter and Stephen apply the prediction expressly to *the Christ*, who is also represented as the antitype of Moses by the author of the Hebrew epistle. Acts iii, 22; vii, 37; Heb. viii, 6. Dr. Jortin, who has drawn a parallel between Moses and Christ in many particulars, concludes with these words: "Let us search all the records of universal history, and see if we can find a man so like to Moses as Christ was, and so like to Christ as Moses was. If we can not, then have we 'found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write,' to be Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God."\*

Whenever the voice of the "lion of the tribe of Judah" is heard, the ungodly tremble, despotism quakes, the righteous rejoice, and the oppressed go free. Wherever Christ is heard and received, there asylums spring up as by magic—asylums for the blind, and deaf, and dumb; asylums for the helpless poor; asylums for vagrant children; asylums for inebriates; asylums for fallen women; houses of refuge for the forlorn and abandoned. The spirit of Christ permeates all these

\* Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History.

philanthropic institutions. Where, in heathen or Christian lands, has infidelity reared an asylum? Where has infidelity inspired hope, raised the fallen, freed the captive? The resurrection of Christ from the dead has made the sweetest and the happiest day the sorrowing world ever experienced. Who, by natural principles, can account for the recognition and observance of the Lord's-day? If any one can, let him speak, for him have I offended. Who can account for the quiet and sublime repose of that beautiful day? As often as that day opens the bustle of the Christian world is hushed, Christians come forth in a tremor of spiritual excitement, day dawns on the night of the grave, and we have God's assurance that Spring shall revisit the moldering urn. On that day all clamor ceases; the wheel of the mill stands still; the plow is stopped in the fresh furrow; every hammer ceases to strike; the hum of the spindle is not heard; you hear no longer the constant clinking of machinery; the mechanic drops his tools, and the tired laborers joyfully hie away to their peaceful homes.

But we must continue our inductive line of argument. In Zechariah ix, 9, we find this strange prediction concerning Christ's public entry into the city of Jerusalem: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold, thy King cometh to thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace to the heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth." The Israelites were forbidden the employment of chariots and horses, Deut. xvii, 16; hence Christ came meekly riding upon an ass, as the people were about to crown him king of the Jews. In this attitude, as he was entering the great city, "a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees, and strewed them in the way. And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried out, *Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest*" heaven! Even the children in the temple cried out irrepressibly, "*Hosanna to the Son of David!*" Matt. xxi, 8, 9, 15. Whereupon, when "the chief priests and scribes" became highly indignant at what they saw, the insulted Savior, quot-

ing from the eighth Psalm, said, "Have you never read, *Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?*"

The most remarkable chapter in the Bible is the fifty-third of Isaiah, which is such a life-like representation of the sufferings of Christ, and which, by no manner of torturing, can possibly apply to any other personage, that both Jews and Gentile infidels have by various methods sought to neutralize its force or set it entirely aside, as not belonging to the canon of Scriptures. Some have even fabricated the idea—the apostate emperor Julian among the rest—that this chapter was written *after* the death of Christ, and foisted into the book of Isaiah by the hands of interested parties, that is to say, *Christians*.\* Beginning with the thirteenth verse of the fifty-second chapter, and embracing the whole of the fifty-third chapter, we find the following remarkable points of agreement between the predictions and sufferings of Christ, as variously represented, of his rejection by the Jews, of his treatment by the Roman government, of his crucifixion, death, and expiation, as well as by the fact that nations and kings should be astonished at the glory of his person, and the universal advancement of his kingdom:

*a.* He was to "grow up before the Lord as a tender plant, and as a root out of dry ground." (His life in Nazareth fulfills the prediction.)

*b.* He was to have "no form nor comeliness, nor any beauty that

\*The late Dr. Scott, in his answer to Rabbi Crool, mentions it as a current and uncontradicted report that the Jews are forbidden by their rabbis to read this important chapter. It is observable that this rabbi, who calls himself "Teacher of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge," in treating of the prophecies touching the Messiah, ignores it entirely. And yet still more singular is the fact that the late Levi, in his two volumes, "Dissertations on the Prophecies Applicable to the Christ," though he has considered the chapters both preceding and following, has contrived to pass over the fifty-third—and the close of the fifty-second as closely connected with it—in absolute silence and indifference, which studied and intended contrivance only goes to prove that, as one who has rejected the Messiah, he did not dare to undertake the investigation. A contrivance, indeed! for who but himself can explain why he closed his ninth series of Isaiah's prophecies in the first volume with chapter lii, 12, and why he began his second volume with chapter liv, as beginning the tenth series? It is well known that the celebrated Earl of Rochester was one of the greatest wits and infidels of the seventeenth century. In his last illness, however, Parsons, the chaplain of Lady R., directed his attention to this chapter, and he thus speaks of the manner in which his mind was affected by it. "He said to me," relates Parsons, "that, as he heard it read, he felt an inward force upon him that did so enlighten his mind and convince him that he could resist it no longer; for the words had an authority which did shoot like rays or beams in his mind, so that he was not only convinced by the reasonings he had about it, but by a power which did so effectually constrain him that he did ever after as firmly believe in his Savior as if he had seen him in the clouds."

we should desire him." (Proved by the fact that he came to the Jews, but the Jews received him not.)

c. He was to be "despised and rejected of men ; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." (Proved by the fact that the birds had nests and the foxes burrows, but the Son of Man not where to lay his head.)

d. Multitudes would "hide their faces from him, despise him, and esteem him not." (Proved by the fact that in his sorest hours of trial his own intimate friends turned away from him.)

e. He was to "bear our griefs and carry our sorrows;" to be "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted;" to be "wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities;" the "chastisement of our peace was to be laid upon him, and by his stripes we were to be healed;" and while the Jews, like sheep, had gone astray, and every one of the world turned to his own way, the Lord laid upon him the iniquities of us all. (Proved by the treatment he received at the hands of the chief priests and scribes ; by hunger, and want, and poverty ; by imputing to him the power of Satan ; by the scoffs of Pharisees and the ridicule of Sadducees ; by his base betrayal on the part of his "own familiar friend;" (Ps. xli, 9—another prediction fulfilled ;) by desertion on the part of his own relatives ; by his unutterable sighings and groanings in the garden of Gethsemane.)

f. He "was oppressed" by those who should have relieved him, and "afflicted" by those who should have ministered to him.

g. He was brought to trial "as a lamb to the slaughter," and, "as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, he opened not his mouth," only as the words were extorted from him.

h. In his mock trial "he was taken from prison and from judgment," and there was no one to "declare his generation"—his manner of life—*no one to declare his innocency* ; a privilege never denied to Jews themselves charged with capital offenses.

i. By his crucifixion, he "was cut off out of the land of the living;" he "died, the just for the unjust."

j. He made "his soul an offering for sin;" he "poured out his soul unto death;" the "Lord bruised him, and put him to death."

k. "He was placed with the wicked in his death; but with the rich man [Joseph of Arimathea] was his sepulcher."\*

\* Kennicutt and Boothroyd.

Let the reader gaze upon this spiritual photograph of the betrayal of Christ by Judas: "And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all my people. And it was broken in that day: and so the poor of the flock that waited upon me knew that it was the Word of the Lord. And I said to them: If you think good, *give me the price*; and if not, forbear. *So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver.* And the Lord said to me, Cast it to the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at by them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord." Zech. xi, 10-13. Judas "cast down the pieces of silver in the temple"—"the house of the Lord"—as expressed in the prediction, "and the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful to put them into the treasury, *because it is the price of blood.* And they took counsel, and *bought with them the potter's field.*" Is not this the miracle of prophecy?

Just on the eve of the Savior's betrayal and death, while in the Mount of Olives, he said sorrowfully to his disciples: "All you shall be offended because of me this night: *for it is written*, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad."\* Where was this written? In the prophecy of Zechariah. "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my associate, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered, and I will turn my hand upon the *little ones*," (the disciples of Christ at the time of his crucifixion.) Alluding to the destruction of Jerusalem, by the Roman power, the same prophet declares: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem; and I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and supplications: and *they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*, and they shall mourn for him as one mourns for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born." Did not the Jews mourn in the deepest anguish of soul, when they saw the Roman army, "the abomination of desolation," standing in the Most Holy Place? The following prediction concerning the Messiah was accurately fulfilled to the very letter: "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, [the second time after the return

\* Matt. xxvi, 31.

of the Jews from Babylonian captivity,] to the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall, in troublous times. And after three-score and two weeks *shall Messiah be cut off*, but not for himself; and the people of the prince [Titus] that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary [Jerusalem and the temple], and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and to the end of the war desolations are determined. And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”\*

The tragic and terrible scenes of the Cross are fearfully and graphically described in the twenty-second Psalm, closing as follows:

“For dogs have compassed me;  
The assembly of the wicked have inclosed me;  
*They pierced my hands and my feet.*  
I may tell all my bones;  
They look and stare upon me.  
They part my garments among them,  
And cast lots upon my vesture.”

The Roman soldiers mocked him, stripped him, put on him a scarlet robe; plaited a crown of thorns and put it upon his head, and placed a reed in his hand; they hailed him King of the Jews in

\* Dan. ix, 25-27. *Seventy weeks*; that is, seventy weeks of years, or four hundred and ninety years, which, reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes, coinciding with the 4,256th year of the Julian period, and in the month of Nisan, in which Ezra was commissioned to restore the Jewish State and polity, Ezra vii, 9-26, will bring us to the month Nisan, of the 4,746th year of the same period, or A. D. 33, the very month and year in which the Christ suffered and finished the work of redemption. The seventy weeks are divided into three periods. 1. Seven weeks, or forty-nine years, for the restoration of Jerusalem; 2. Sixty-two weeks, or four hundred and thirty-four years, from that time to the announcement of the Messiah by John the Baptist; 3. One week, or seven years, for the ministry of John and of the Christ to the crucifixion. But it should be observed that it is almost impossible, at this distance of time, to fix these dates to a month, or even a year, since the Jews had two years, one beginning in the Spring and the other in Autumn, in addition to which, before the beginning of the New Testament chronology, there is discovered a *hiatus* of three or four years. The date of the Messiah's death, however, is astronomically settled by Ferguson at A. D. 33.

“*And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week.*” Boothroyd, in explanation of this, remarks, that the Romans made a league with the Medes, Parthians, and others, that they might be at liberty, with all their strength, to prosecute the war with the Jews. They did so, and in the midst of this period, A. D. 70, all Jewish sacrifices ceased forever. The reckoning days for years, and weeks of such years, is not peculiar to the Scriptures. Varro says he entered into the twelfth week of his years; that is, his eighty-fourth year. We omit the details of this most remarkable prophecy from Daniel.



derision ; they spit upon him, and with the reed smote him on the head. They gave him vinegar to drink, mixed with gall. They crucified him and parted his garments, casting lots. These were the Gentile "dogs" and bulls of Bashan. They gaped upon him with their mouths. "Many bulls"—the roaring rabble—rushing by, reviled him, and wagged their heads. They cried out, "If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross ; save thyself." The chief priests, and scribes, and elders "shot out their lips," and shaking their heads, derisively said, "He saved others ; himself he can not save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him." The crucified thieves "cast the same in his teeth." No wonder "there was darkness over all the land," amid such horrid scenes, the consummation of diabolism.

The triumph of the Savior over Satan and the grave is a signal fulfillment of this remarkable passage in Genesis : "*I will put enmity between thee [the serpent] and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed : it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*" Though this was the first promise made in the remote ages, it was the last in execution. All succeeding promises gradually and harmoniously developed out of this. There was one grand purpose revealed in every succeeding promise, and a divine method marks every one of them, from the first inception to the final consummation, as we have clearly exhibited in the foregoing outlines of the moral miracle of prophecy. "The Prince of this world, the Spirit of disobedience," was "judged" and conquered by the Lion of the tribe of Judah. "The bright and the morning Star" dawned upon the night of the grave. "The stem of Jesse" has developed into a majestic tree, under whose wide-spreading branches all the families of the earth may find shelter and repose. The Sun of Righteousness, set in the heaven of heavens, irradiates the valley of the shadow of death by his beams of light and life. The Son of Mary stoops to conquer, and, as the Ancient of days, breaks the bars of death, and stoops to death no more. David sung in sweetest strains the mighty conquest of Jesus in the grave :

"I have set the Lord always before me ;  
Because he is at my right-hand, I shall not be moved.  
Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoices ;  
My flesh shall rest in hope.  
*For thou wilt not leave my soul in hades ;*

*Neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.  
Thou wilt show me the path of life;  
In thy presence fullness of joy;  
At thy right-hand pleasures for evermore.\**

The risen and triumphant Lord, whom the gates of death could not hold, and who, after his resurrection from the gloomy grave, convinced the apostles "*by many infallible proofs*," that he was the Prince of Peace that should "*bruise the serpent's head*," ascended to heaven in the presence of his chosen witnesses. And as he nears the crystal gates of the kingdom of light, the hosts of God who bear him company cry aloud:

"Lift up your heads, O ye gates;  
And be lift up, ye everlasting doors;  
And the King of glory shall come in.  
Who is the King of glory?  
The Lord strong and mighty,  
The Lord mighty in battle.  
Lift up your heads, O ye gates;  
Even lift them up, ye everlasting doors;  
And the King of glory shall come in.  
Who is this King of glory?  
The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory.†

The throne of David is now re-established. Christ was to descend from the lineage of David, who belonged to the royal tribe of Judah. The royal house of David had fallen into decay, but Christ is now raised up to sit upon the throne of David. "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord,‡ who doeth all these things." Peter, on the day of Pentecost, referring to the "patriarch David," declares, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne."§ . . . "For David is not ascended into the heavens, but he saith himself, The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right-hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool."

The spread of the Gospel, which is the history of the Church, is fulfilled in this remarkable declaration, uttered by Jehovah at the cor-

\* Psalm xvi.

† Acts xv, 15-17; quoted from Amos by the apostle James.

‡ Psalm xxiv.

§ Psalm cxxii, 11.

onation of King David's greater Son: "*Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.*" "The stone that was cut out of the mountain without hands"\* should finally crush all other kingdoms. "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endures. He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents; the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him." "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."†

"God's mountain was to be established, not on Mount Moriah alone, but upon the mountains every-where; and be exalted above the hills." "Out of Zion goes forth the law, and the Word of Jehovah from Jerusalem."‡ This law, the amplification of the Sermon on the Mount, should become the molding power of all nations, subordinate all kings, and regenerate all people. The stone cut out of the mountain without hands should fill the earth. All kings must own the sway and sovereignty of Christ seated upon the throne of David. The prophet oracularly declares: "It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: *I will also give thee for a LIGHT to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation to the end of the earth.*"§ "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea." The universal monarchy of Christ was to entirely supplant David's temporal kingdom. The symbol in prophecy of David's kingdom is the hill of Zion; the mountain of the Lord is the Church of Christ in every land. "The scepter was to depart from Judah when Shiloh came;"|| and he that was born in Bethlehem-Ephratah, the old home of David's family, a province "too small to be reckoned among the thousands," "whose goings forth have been from the days of eternity," now, by the voice of his authority, startles

\* Dan. ii, 45.

§ Isaiah xlix, 6.

VOL. IV.—17

† Psalm lxxii, 7.

|| Gen. xlix, 10.

‡ Isaiah lxx, 8, 9.

every king from his throne, shakes the foundations of earthly kingdoms, strikes down every heathen idol, breaks the fetters of the human mind, and frees the soul from the bondage of sin.

Speaking of the perpetuity of the throne of David, and the remarkable predictions centering in Christ, as belonging to the royal line, R. Payne Smith, in his late work, "*Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*," thus refers to the perplexity of the Jews :

"The ancient Jews did not misunderstand these prophecies. They mused upon them in sorrow, for they saw in them the overthrow of the nation. Still, there was comfort. As Jeremiah so repeatedly prophesied, God would never make 'a full end' of them; or, in Isaiah's words, 'a remnant would remain.' A root was to spring out of dry ground; a sucker was to spring up from the roots of Jesse's prostrate tree; a booth, at all events, would be inhabited among the ruins of Uzziah's palace. And thus, after their expressive way, one of their names for the Messiah was, 'The Son of the fallen.' Now, how came these prophets to know that two such contrary things would be combined in Christ, as the fall of David's throne and its establishment forever? That, like Solomon the Magnificent, he would be the Prince of Peace, with the key of government upon his shoulder, and yet one despised and rejected of men? The Jews could not understand this contradiction, and they divided the prophecies between two Messiahs. To one, the son of Joseph, they gave all the passages which spake of Christ's humiliation, and rejection, and death; to the other, the Son of David, they applied all those which spake of his kingdom, and triumph, and glory. In Jesus of Nazareth all these passages are combined in one harmonious yet unexpected solution. All equally find in him their place and meaning, though that a very different meaning from what any uninspired expositor had ever imagined."

This mighty conqueror is abroad among the nations now, consummating the last great work by the word of his mouth. "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse, and he that sat upon him was called FAITHFUL and TRUE, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns, and he had a name written that no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called THE WORD OF GOD. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp SWORD, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture, and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

As the ages roll on, the wonder still increases that a personage,

eighteen centuries ago, rejected of the Jews and spurned by the Greeks, now bears sway over all the earth; to whom the kings of the earth do homage and pay willful tribute; for the extension of whose kingdom millions of money are yearly expended; the voice of whose authority, and the sentiment of whose soul, are heard and honored by lords and legislators; in honor of whose name the sweetest songs are sung, the loftiest praise expressed, the noblest deeds done; for whom, as the great benefactor of our race, poets picture their sublimest sentiments, sculptors chisel the finest statues, painters delineate the grandest truths; at whose command the commerce of the civilized world moves, the fleets of the sea sail on errands of mercy, and at whose authoritative bidding numberless rail cars speed their flight night and day, bearing the rich fruitage of every clime, the gold, and silver, and precious stones of every land; for whose majesty and glory the printing press unceasingly works—the mighty angel of God, flying abroad on swiftest wings, drops the Word of God in every hamlet, bearing the Light of Life across the deep blue sea, publishing glad tidings of great joy to the isles of the ocean, and chasing darkness out of the valley of the shadow of death. Surely, the Lord destroys the wisdom of the wise, and brings to nothing the science of the philosopher. The wisdom of this world has been made to appear foolishness, and by the foolishness of the preaching the Cross the world of rational beings is stirred to its deepest depths. “Christ crucified,” is still the power and wisdom of God. Every school of infidelity is confounded by the things chosen of God; and Messrs. Strauss, and Baur, and Schenkel, and Keim, and Rénan are confounded by the very things they despised, even as the Egyptians, under Pharaoh, were cursed by the very things they idolized, when the ten plagues were sent upon them. The Galilean fishermen and the tent-maker still live, and influence the councils of the nations. They continue to be an astonishment to the world. The apostles sit upon twelve thrones of glory, serenely judging the world—upon thrones more resplendent than the ivory-golden throne of Solomon, more dazzling, a thousand times, than the brazen monuments of the far-famed Cæsars. The questions still recur—“*What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he?*” As to the flesh, *the son of Mary*; as to the spirit, *the Son of God, IMMANUEL!*

## VI.—CHRISTOLOGY.

*"The Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ. By J. A. REUBELT, D. D.  
Based on the German of W. F. GESS. Second Edition. 1871."*

THE Christological work, whose title is given above, has been before the religious public a little more than two years, and seems to be entirely forgotten by this time. Through the personal efforts of the author about fourteen hundred copies were sold, and only about one hundred and fifty through the regular trade. The work is written, by universal consent, not without ability and learning, and breathes throughout a reverential spirit of submission to the Bible, but has, although treating of a subject that must be dear to every Christian, fallen almost as a dead letter on the Christian ear. The writer, who has followed the expression of public opinion about it with some interest, has, indeed, seen several notices of it, giving the title and disposing of its claims in about half a dozen sentences, but not a single review, nothing like a fair examination of its merits or demerits. Mr. Haven, in *Zion's Herald*, closed a short article on it with the hearty wish that it might find few readers, and make fewer converts. Henry Ward Beecher found in it a rehash of mediæval scholasticism and nonsense, although the book in question passes in review every christological passage of the New Testament. Other periodicals and reviews referred to it in more respectful language, but spoke of its peculiar features as exploded errors, as, e. g., the *Princeton Repository* and the *Lutheran Review*. What does this phenomenon mean? Is the so-called Christian world tired of the Christ of the New Testament, or so enamored of its own Christ, so fully convinced of its own infallibility, that it considers the labor lost that would be spent in re-examining the Bible teachings on this most stupendous subject? Or does it require a great name and brilliant rhetoric to gain favor for a work on Christ with a Christian public? To inveigh in unmeasured terms against papal infallibility and servitude to tradition is one thing, and to act the part of an evangelical freeman is quite another. The various prints of the "Christian Church" have



given short, favorable notices of the book, but have invariably withheld their judgment until they could make a more thorough investigation; but time or inclination seems to have been wanting so far for this investigation, and, from all appearances, may never come. What betokens this? Indifference or self-sufficiency, as in the other cases? Or is it, perhaps, best not to meddle with such a deep subject, and to content one's self with a scrupulous use of the Bible terms? In the writer's opinion the latter expedient is a fallacy. The most superficial reader of the New Testament knows that, e. g., the term "Son of God" is used in at least three different meanings in the New Testament—the term meaning the theocratic king, the servant of God, (*παῖς θεοῦ*;) the virgin's son, called the son of God in the same sense in which Adam is thus called; and Son of God in a metaphysical sense, (*υἱὸς θεοῦ*;) and, since the Christian's eternal hope rests on Christ, should it not be worth his while to examine the whole subject as carefully as he possibly can? Do not the nature of the case and the positive declarations of Christ himself point out such an examination as an imperative duty? We say, as a people, that the Reformation of Luther and Calvin was merely a return to the Christianity of earlier ages as developed in the Roman Catholic sense. This is, to a great extent, true; as, e. g., the ideas of satisfaction, atonement, vicarious sacrifice are the productions of scholastic theology almost utterly unknown to the better epochs of the Christian Church. We, as a body, profess to go beyond Wittenberg, Geneva, and Rome to Jerusalem, the seat of primitive Christianity. Well, but are we going to fold our arms and sit still in the doomed city till destruction overtake us? Is our whole Christology to end in a dry and lifeless Ebionitism? Or can we not be anxious enough, in order to avoid this catastrophe, to hasten back to good old orthodoxy, riveting our whole attention to one or two points, to the utter neglect of all other matters, although Christian baptism can not possibly be understood without a Biblical Christology? Jesus himself asked the Pharisees, "What think ye of the Christ? whose Son is he?" and when they answered, not incorrectly, "David's," he asked again, "If David calls him Lord," and the Pharisees admitted that David had called him Lord, "How is he his Son?" It is true that David, in calling the Messiah his Lord, made use of a term that does not necessarily imply the Supreme Being; but David, the theocratic king,

calling the Messiah his Lord, designated thereby the latter as something essentially more than a mere man, and had reference to something higher than official character. "How is he his Son?" In this simple question is the solemn duty to study the Christology of the New Testament solemnly inculcated. Not to go beyond what is written, not to substitute vain speculations for the teachings of the divine Word, is a solemn duty; but to abstain from every effort to understand the teachings, even the mysterious teachings, of the Bible, is criminal indifference and a heinous sin.

Of all the quarterlies the Lutheran (Quarterly) alone has entered, to some extent, into the nature of the case. It says (July No. of 1871, pp. 466 *et seq.*)

"Do the Scriptures teach that the incarnation of the Logos was an act of self-divestiture—that the eternal Logos underwent a change in his incarnation, divesting himself of his divine form of existence and of his attributes? That the incarnation was a profound mystery, and that there was a hiding of the divine majesty and glory, we may safely admit. But that there was an actual laying aside, a 'self-divestiture' of the divine attributes, we have failed to see the proof. That Christ really possessed these attributes during this very period of his humiliation, we think can be amply proved from the Scriptures."

This seems to us to be a fair challenge. If it can be proved by one passage of the New Testament that Jesus was, from the moment of his incarnation up to his expiation on the cross, possessed of a really divine attribute, the whole fabric of the incarnation, as raised in the book under review, falls to rise no more, and the passages speaking of the Logos becoming man, of the Logos emptying himself, must be differently interpreted, the protest against two sets of self-consciousness in the Redeemer loses, measurably, its force. Jesus had either a divine and a human self-consciousness, apart and distinct, or the human self-consciousness was absorbed by the divine consciousness, as Dr. Schaff will have it, and Jesus was only in body, not in reality, a man. But does the Gettysburg reviewer prove his position? Does he advance a single passage that ascribes a really divine attribute to Jesus during the period stated? We say most positively, without any fear of successful contradiction, No! He refers to the accounts of Christ's birth, the name "Immanuel," "the holy thing," terms on which no intelligent believer in the divinity of Christ will base his belief; he quotes, then, at random, a number of passages wherein the Savior speaks of his pre-existence, of his hav-

ing been sent into this world, of his relation to the Father, etc.—passages all of which are examined organically in the book, and pronounced to be in perfect harmony with the great declaration, that “the Logos became flesh,” that “he who was in the form of God, emptied himself and took upon him the form of a servant.” All arguments against the real (not apparent) *κένωσις* of the Logos are of an *a priori* character; that is, it is established, on deistic principles, what the Logos could do and what he could not do, and with this philosophical fiat the New Testament is made to tally. In the case before us it is taken for granted that the Logos could not and can not empty himself, that he can not and could not become man, and therefore he did not empty himself, did not become man, and all the passages of the Scripture that *seem* to teach, in the most unequivocal language, these assumed philosophical impossibilities, are tortured, stretched, mistranslated, that they may say what they are required to say. But against such a procedure we must and do enter our decided protest. If the Bible is the Word of God, its teachings must be true; facts stated therein must be possibilities, no matter whether our “common sense” can see this or not. With the devout Bible student the question is: What does the Bible teach on a subject? and having ascertained, by a conscientious use of all helps within his reach, what the Bible does teach in every individual passage, and, on the whole, he reverently accepts it, fully persuaded that the individual passages will ultimately agree, and that the Bible doctrine will ultimately legitimate itself as the unqualified truth. Lord Macaulay declares it, in one of his essays, as a mark of Goethe's masterly genius, that his Mephistopheles, while engaged with Faust in some equestrian feat, pays no attention to any equestrian rules, shows no apprehension of any mishap, but cuts the strangest antics, the wildest capers, and finally comes out all right; had Mephistopheles been a less able rider, he would have acted differently. So in the case before us—whoever really believes in the divinity of the Bible, follows out its teachings, not apprehending in the least that he will be landed on “the confines of atheism,” or materialism, or any other ism. As with Christology, so it is with eschatology; here the *prejudices* are, that the human spirit is constitutionally immortal; that the human body is the prison-house of the spirit; that death is a setting free of the imprisoned spirit, etc. The Bible may teach what

it pleases ; may positively declare that God *alone* is immortal ; that immortality is synonymous with eternal life, eternal bliss, and a *gift* of God ; that death is the consequence of sin and not of a divine appointment ; the Bible teachings must conform to the dreams of Plato, and this settles the question. Whoever reads the Gospel accounts of Jesus, especially those of the fourth Gospel, intelligently and with an unbiased mind, is impressed with regard to the Savior's person as follows : 1. that Jesus was a real man, sharing all the attributes and wants of human nature, free alone from sin ; 2. that Jesus had, prior to his coming into the world, enjoyed a self-conscious existence of supreme bliss with his Father ; 3. that during his earthly existence this blissful existence in communion with the Father was, in part, suspended, for which reason Jesus longs and prays for a return to the Father ; 4. that there is absolutely but one principle of personality in Jesus, and not the most remote trace of *a* divine and *a* human consciousness ; 5. that while Jesus claims and puts forth knowledge and power superior to that of man and angels, he disclaims as distinctly really divine powers, such as Omnipotence, Omniscience, Omnipresence, representing himself as the ambassador of his Father, whose doctrine he preaches, whose will he reveals, by whose power he performs his miracles ; 6. Jesus himself and his apostles speak of him both in his ante-mundane and glorified state as dependent on the Father, the exalted Savior praying to the Father as well as Jesus on earth, while the Holy Spirit prays to Father and Son. The writer heartily believes that every Christological passage of the New Testament tallies with one or the other of these propositions, thus making a consistent organic whole. The importance of correct Christological views can not possibly be overrated, Jesus being the corner-stone of the fabric of Christianity ; an intelligent faith requires a correct knowledge of Jesus.

It is, indeed, a consoling thought, that erroneous views will not keep any one from rest ; yet a healthful Christian life is possible only with correct views of Jesus. The Nestorian orthodoxy of the day has driven many to Unitarianism, so that the latter have in the Savior a man, a mere man, however good and exalted, while the orthodox, or evangelicals, have in him *a* God and *a* man—logically a monstrosity, an impossibility. Those that hold the theory of substitution, may, indeed, in a manner satisfactory to themselves, conceive

of the God as strengthening the man Jesus to such an extent that the latter was able to bear the weight of God's wrath, perfectly unconcerned how the God-consciousness is affected by so mercenary views. The Unitarian has, indeed, in Jesus, a perfect teacher and model of human perfection; but if Jesus was only the outgrowth, the blossom of the confessedly fallen race, then Jesus' influence is only moral; real, dynamic influence is out of the question, and what the New Testament says of Jesus as the second Adam, the regenerator of the race, the imparter of higher powers of holiness, is simply figurative, and therefore, meaningless. For this reason we venture to call upon all that really love the Savior to re-examine the subject once more in a manner commensurate with its importance, and the book briefly noticed here may be of some help in this investigation.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

---

### HOME LITERATURE.

#### BOOKS.

- 1.—*Systematic Theology*. By CHARLES HODGE, D. D., *Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey*. Volume II. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson & Sons. 1872. 8vo. pp. 732.

THIS volume is a worthy companion of the one which preceded it. It discusses questions which are more in sympathy with the present age than those discussed in the first volume. Anthropology and Soteriology are subjects which have occupied the attention of the modern Church more than they did the patristic Church. In fact, it may be safely said that Dr. Hodge's second volume covers almost the entire ground of recent theological controversy; and, as the Doctor's style is very clear, his scholarship of a high order, and his candor generally all that could be desired, we might reasonably expect a work of great value on the important subjects he discusses. Nor will any one be disappointed. The work is even more than was expected. It is simply invaluable to those who wish to have a clear, concise statement of the living issues of the present age.

While we are pleased to give this general commendation of the work, truth compels us to say that it contains many objectionable features. While it was expected that the doctrine of "original sin" would be set forth according to the most approved style of the Calvinistic theology, still we were scarcely prepared for the statement that man's "inability arises from the want of spiritual discernment," and is "asserted only in reference to things of the spirit." In proof of this position the Doctor cites 1 Cor. ii, 14, and gives us the following as the teaching of the passage:

"1. That the natural or unrenewed man does not receive the things of the Spirit. 2. The reason why he does not receive them is declared to be that they are foolishness unto him, or that he can not know them. 3. And the reason why he can not know them is that they are spiritually discerned. It is ignorance, the want of discernment of the beauty, excellence, and suitableness of the things of the Spirit, (*i. e.*, of the truths which the Spirit has revealed,) that is the reason or cause of unbelief."



Now, if the natural man is the unregenerate man, (or "unrenewed" man, as Dr. Hodge says,) and as "he must be renewed by the Holy Ghost," we are curious to know how any one can ever be "renewed" at all, according to the Doctor's theology. For, if the unrenewed man can not receive the things of the Spirit, he can not receive any thing the Spirit does for him, and, as he can not be converted any other way, it seems to us he is entirely cut off from the means of salvation. But it seems to us, also, that the Doctor's exegesis contains at least two errors: first, that the "natural" man is the "unrenewed" man; second, that this unrenewed man must be regenerated by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of spiritual influence in regeneration is as follows; namely: first, it is mysterious and peculiar; second, distinct from common grace; third, distinct from moral suasion; fourth, acts immediately, and is in a certain sense physical; fifth, it is irresistible; sixth, the soul is passive; seventh, regeneration is instantaneous; eighth, it is an act of sovereign grace. This is the unadulterated Augustinian doctrine of "efficacious grace," and our readers will be anxious to know how such a doctrine is supported by such an able theologian as Dr. Hodge. We select the following "Argument from the Nature of Regeneration," as giving the best sample of the Doctor's method of reasoning:

"The Scriptures not only teach that regeneration is the work of the immediate omnipotent agency of the Spirit, but they give such an account of its nature as admits of no other explanation of its cause. It is a kind of work which nothing but Almighty Power can accomplish. It is a *ζωοποιήσις*, a *making alive*. Originating life is, from its nature, an act of God; for he alone can give life. It is also an act of immediate power. It precludes the intervention of second causes as much as creation does. Christ was raised from the dead by the power of God. So was Lazarus. So are the regenerated. Spiritual resurrection is just as really and literally an act of making alive as calling a dead body to life. The one occurs in the sphere of the outward, the other in the sphere of the spiritual world. But the one is just as real a communication of life as the other. When the principle of life is communicated to a dead body, all the chemical properties which belong to it are controlled by the vital force, so as to make them work for its preservation and increase, instead of for its disintegration. And when the principle of spiritual life is imparted to the soul, it controls all its mental and moral energies, so that they work to its spiritual nourishment and growth in grace. The Scriptures, therefore, in teaching that regeneration is a quickening, do thereby reveal to us its nature as a work, not of man, or of moral suasion, or of divine efficiency operating through second causes, but of the immediate, and therefore the almighty power of God.

"The Bible teaches the same truth when it declares believers to be new creatures, and says that they are created anew in Christ Jesus. Creation is the work of God, and it is an immediate work. It precludes the intervention of means. It is of necessity the work of Almighty Power, and therefore the Scriptures so often claim it as the peculiar prerogative of God. It is true that the Greek and Hebrew words which we translate by the English word *create*, are often used in the sense of *to make*, to fashion out of pre-existent materials. They occur, also, in a secondary or figurative sense, and express in such cases only the idea of a great, and generally a favorable, change, no matter how produced. It would not, therefore, be sufficient to establish the Augustinian doctrine of regeneration that it is called a creation, if in other parts of Scripture it were spoken of as a change produced by second causes, and if the means and the mode were described. In that case it would be natural

to take the word in a figurative sense. But the contrary of all this is true. If the Bible taught the eternity of matter, or that the world is an emanation from God, or a mode of God's existence, we should be forced to give a figurative sense to the words, 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.' But as the Scriptures tell us that God alone is eternal, and that all else owes its existence to his will, we are authorized and bound to retain these words in their simple and sublime significance. Now, as regeneration is always declared to be God's work, his peculiar work, and a work of his mighty power, analogous to that which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead; as it is declared to be a making alive, an opening of the eyes, and an unstopping the ears, then, when it is also called a new creation, we are bound to understand that term as containing a new assertion that it is a work of almighty power.

"Another common Scriptural representation leads to the same conclusion. Believers are the children of God, not merely as his rational creatures, but as the subjects of a new birth. They are born of God. They are born of the Spirit. They are begotten of God. 1 John v, 1-18. The essential idea in such representations is that of communication of life. We derive one form of life from our corrupt earthly parents, and another from the Spirit. 'That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit.' John iii, 6. In the case of creatures, this communication of life by the parent to the offspring is merely transmission. In the case of God, the fountain of all life, it is a real communication. He originates the life which he gives. As it is utterly incongruous to think of a creature's begetting itself, or originating its own life, and no less incongruous to regard this commencement of life or being as brought about by secondary influences, so is it utterly inconsistent with the Scriptures to regard regeneration as a man's own work, or as due to his co-operation, or as produced by the influences of truth. As well might it be assumed that light, heat, and moisture could make a dead seed germinate and bring forth fruit. All beginning of life is directly from God; and this is what the Bible most explicitly asserts to be true of regeneration. Those who become the children of God are 'born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' John i, 13.

"This argument is not invalidated by the fact that Paul says to the Corinthians, 'I have begotten you through the Gospel.' All words are used literally and figuratively; and no man is misled—or need be—by this change of meaning. We are accustomed to speak of one man as the spiritual father of another man, without any fear of being misunderstood. When the historian tells us that the monk Augustine converted the Britons, or the American missionaries the Sandwich Islanders, we are in no danger of mistaking his meaning any more than when it is said that Moses divided the Red Sea, or brought water out of the rock, or gave the people manna out of heaven. The same Paul who told the Corinthians that he had 'begotten them through the Gospel,' told them in another place, 'I have planted, Apollos watered: but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase.' 1 Cor. iii, 6, 7.

"In 1 Peter i, 23, it is written: 'Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.' From this passage it is sometimes inferred that the new birth is a change produced, not by the immediate agency of God, but instrumentally by the Word, and therefore by a rational process, or moral suasion. It has, however, been already remarked that regeneration is often taken in the wide sense of conversion; that is, for the whole change which takes place in the sinner when he is made a child of God. This is a comprehensive change, including all that takes place in the consciousness, and all that occurs in the soul itself, so to speak, below the consciousness, and subsequently in the state and relation of the soul to God. In this change the Word of God is eminently instrumental. It is by the Word that the sinner is convinced, aroused, made to seek reconciliation with God, and enlightened in the way of salvation. It is by the Word that the person and work of Christ are revealed, and all the objects on which the activity of the regenerated soul terminates are presented to the mind. The Gospel is, therefore, the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. It is by the Word that all the graces of the Spirit are called into exercise, and without it holiness, in all its conscious manifestations, would be as impossible as vision without light. But this does not

prove that light produces the faculty of seeing; neither does truth produce the principle of spiritual life. The Apostle Paul, who glories so much in the Gospel, who declares that it is by the foolishness of preaching that God saves those that believe, still teaches that the inward work of the Spirit is necessary to enable men to receive the things freely given to them of God; that the natural man receives not the things of the Spirit, that they must be spiritually discerned. 1 Cor. ii, 8-11. As examples of the latitude with which the words beget, begotten, and new birth are used in Scripture, reference need be made only to such passages as 1 Peter i, 3, where it is said, He 'hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,' and 1 Cor. iv, 15. There is, therefore, nothing in what the Scriptures teach of the agency of the truth in conversion or regeneration, in the wide sense of the word, inconsistent with their distinct assertion that, in its narrow sense of quickening or imparting spiritual life, it is an act of the immediate omnipotence of God."

Such are some of the reasons given in favor of the doctrine of regeneration growing out of the Augustinian anthropology and soteriology. And from this it must be evident that Princeton, at least, is still severely orthodox.

---

2.—*The To-morrow of Death; or, the Future Life, according to Science.* By LOUIS FIGUIER. Translated from the French, by S. R. CROCKER. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1872. 16mo. pp. 395.

THERE can be no question that this book discusses problems which are full of interest to almost every body, and the curious method adopted by the author is likely to attract to his book very general attention. He tells us that for the greater part of his life he had regarded the future life as entirely beyond the mental grasp, and hence it was the part of wisdom not to trouble one's mind with it. "But one day, one dreadful day, a thunderbolt struck him. He lost his beloved son on whom all the hopes, the ambitions, of his life were centered." Then in the bitterness of his grief he began to ponder on the future life. He first questioned the exact sciences, and then ignorant and simple men, and in this way learned, as he thinks, all about the future life.

He regards man as composed of three elements: first, the body, a material substance; second, life, or the vital force; third, the soul, or the inner sense. The life and the soul are essentially distinct; the life is perishable, while the soul is immortal. Death is the separation of the soul and the body. At death the body undergoes change, and as life is a force engendered by certain causes, it comes to an end, and beyond this end it is nothing. The soul, however, passes into a new body, to constitute a being greatly superior to man in moral power. This super-human being has his home in the upper atmosphere—in the planetary ether, which is made up of hydrogen gas excessively rarified. This hydrogen-heaven begins at an elevation of thirty or forty leagues above the earth. However, all who die do not go into this rarified ether. Only the good souls can fly so high. Bad souls,

and the souls of very little children, are at death re-embodied. These live over again their earthly lives, until, having lived and died frequent enough for their entire satisfaction, and for their necessary purification, they at last get up into the plane of hydrogen gas, which is heaven. Into this region all the inhabitants of all the planets at last come; and, when there, "the respiration of the ethereal medium suffices to nourish" them. There is no night there, neither do they sleep. There is no distinction of sex, nor any cause for contention, but "all will yield themselves to quiet and gentle sentiments." But death is there. This still preys upon the dross, but it refines the gold, for it is through successive deaths and resurrections that the superhuman rises to higher regions and mightier living. Thus, from planet to planet souls are translated, until at last the sun is reached, which is the final home of all human souls. This is their resting-place, the final limit to their vast journey through space. But at this point we must let the author state his theory in his own language. Speaking of the superhuman being who has made the necessary journey through the heavens, and who at last arrives at the state of pure spirit, the author says:

"Reaching the sun, he is divested of all material substance, all carnal alloy. He is a flame, a breath; he is all intelligence, sentiment, and thought; no impurity mingles with his perfect essence. He is an absolute soul, a soul without a body. The gaseous blazing mass that constitutes the sun is, therefore, set apart for these quintessential beings. A throne of fire must be the throne of souls.

"We might go further, and argue that the sun is not only the home and receptacle of souls who have completed the cycle of their wanderings in the world, but is also nothing else than the very assemblage of those souls come from different planets after passing through the intermediate states that we have described. The sun must be, then, an aggregation of souls.

"Since the sun is the first cause of life on our globe; since it is, as we have shown, the origin of life, of feeling, and of thought; since it is the determining cause of all organized life on the earth—why may we not declare that the rays transmitted by the sun to the earth and the other planets are nothing more or less than the emanations of these souls? that these are the emissions of pure spirits living in the radiant star, that come to us, and to dwellers in the other planets, under the visible form of rays?"

It can not be denied that this fanciful theory is supported by many scientific facts; still the whole discussion furnishes a fine illustration of our utter inability to advance by scientific methods to any definite knowledge of the future. Reason is impotent and blind in the presence of death. The New Testament Scriptures furnish us the only satisfactory solution of the "land of the hereafter." "Life and immortality were brought to light through the Gospel," and vain are all efforts to scientifically formulate any doctrine on these subjects that is not revealed to us in God's Word.

"The To-morrow of Death" is a book belonging to the same class as "Gates Ajar," but has little of the personal interest of Miss Phelps' work. Louis Figuier is an author of wide reputation, and his scientific works have

been largely circulated, even among English readers. But this volume, while it contains much valuable information, will be read rather as a literary curiosity than because its theories of the future life are worth any thing to any body.

---

3.—*The Infinite and the Finite.* By THEOPHILUS PARSONS. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1872. 16mo. pp. 186.

ONE of the curious facts about philosophical speculations is, that men will assume to understand the infinite, when it is abundantly demonstrable that they know very little of the finite. There are many problems in physiology and psychology which have never yet been solved, but these are of secondary importance, and can be indefinitely postponed, until all questions relating to Deity have been satisfactorily disposed of. Men who can not explain the simplest laws of human life, will not hesitate a moment in offering their crude conceptions of the trinity as an article of religious faith. It seems to us that here is a problem that philosophers might busy themselves about for a little while. Why is it that men will continue to make fools of themselves when there are so many opportunities for a display of wisdom and prudence? A thoughtfully written book upon this subject would likely benefit mankind infinitely more than the one now before us.

Mr. Parsons is a Swedenborgian, hence his views of the infinite and finite may readily be imagined. Still we are disposed to let him speak for himself. He says:

"Whatever is, was created, excepting the Creator. If we go up with the ascending series of cause and effect, when we come to the summit we find that which was not caused; for if it were caused, we must go a step farther to find *its* cause. And that which is at the summit, and is itself not caused, has the whole series below it, and must be the cause of all causation.

"The totality of being consists of Creator and created. But the Creator, whom we will call God, did not create out of nothing. If God willed that something should be which was not before, his will, his thought, his power, were there, and clothed themselves with the effect and were in the thing he caused to be. He did not create *out of* nothing; for if what he created consisted of nothing, it would be nothing. He created from himself, and is himself the substance of all that is; for he created all things from his own substance, and is in all things that are. In the phrase which the apostles used so often, he is 'all in all.' Is this Pantheism? It would be so if we held that the totality of created things constituted God, and all the God there is. But then there would be no Creator. The doctrine above expressed is discriminated from Pantheism by two truths which find no place in that dreary theory. One is, that God, the cause, exists prior to the created universe, or to the effect, and remains as distinct from it after creation as before.

"Prior in degree, in nature: I do not say prior in time; for when we attempt a consideration of the beginning *in time* of the putting forth of Divine power in the work of creation, we go beyond the limitations of finite thought. But God is prior to the universe in degree, and perfectly distinct from it while he forms and fills it.

"The other truth—which is indeed but another form of the first, or a consequence of

it—is that the created universe is as distinct from God as he is distinct from his creation; for God, the Creator, *gives* to every thing he creates to be itself, to be other than him, and distinct from him; or, in other words, he so created every thing that it may possess its own identity or self-hood, and thus be itself and not him.”

All of which, of course, is very profound; and is, doubtless, quite valuable to those who desire to have knowledge above what is written.

When Mr. Parsons comes to discuss the question, “What is matter?” he attempts to avoid the idealist theory; but it seems to us that he does practically reduce all matter to mind. When we look at a tree, we see only a minute picture painted on the back of the eye. This is all the mind can see, if indeed it can be said to see this. Why then does any one think he is looking at a tree of a certain size in a certain place? Simply because he has formed the habit of thinking that he sees trees. He comes up to it, step by step. It is a natural result from the familiarity with time, space, shape, and dimension. We think we know things are where we see and feel them. But all we know, or can know, is that through our sensations, and our thoughts about these sensations, “something” produces the impressions which we have. We suppose it is *something* like the case of the old woman, who attempted to repeat that familiar verse in which Canaan and Jordan are both spoken of. She had forgotten both Canaan and Jordan, but remembered well that it read:

“So to the Jews old *something* stood,  
While *something* rolled between.”

But let us hear Mr. Parsons again:

“We look at an insect one-tenth of an inch long. We wish to examine it, and we make use of a lens magnifying ten-fold in linear direction, and the insect is now an inch long. We say it *is* one-tenth of an inch long, and *seems* to be an inch long because we see it through that convex glass. But it is the convex lenses of the eye which make it appear one-tenth of an inch long. If they were more or less convex, it would be longer or shorter. Perhaps we see, in a book on Entomology, two drawings of the insect, one a tenth of an inch long, and this is marked ‘actual size;’ and the other an inch long, and this is marked ‘magnified ten times;’ and yet one of these is just as much the actual size as the other. Seen through the lenses of the eye, it has the shorter length; if we add another lens, it has the greater length. If the added lens is concave, it looks less than one-tenth of an inch. We can not see it at all except through the lenses of the eye; and their form and arrangement, and nothing else whatever, determine the length it shall seem to have. This we may diminish or enlarge at pleasure by using additional lenses; and through all these lenses, those in the head and those outside of it, light, acting in accordance with certain known laws, paints the picture we contemplate, and paints it such in shape and dimension as those lenses—whether made for us or made by us—determine. What, then, is an inch, or a tenth of an inch in length?”

What is an inch? Why, of course, it is simply *something*, but precisely what that something is no one can tell. It is all in the eye. Things have existence, but have no size or place. What a delightful philosophy this is! No wonder the homeopathic system of medicine is philosophical. Why not, since infinitesimals are no smaller than Cook’s pills?



It is certainly a good thing that we have some profound thinkers, and among these we may properly class Mr. Parsons. But would it not be a better thing if these thinkers would spend their time solving problems of some practical importance? Surely this age has need of all the brains it has, but it is not certain that such a use of brains as Mr. Parsons has made will ever be of any great service to mankind.

---

4.—*The Land of the Veda: Being Personal Reminiscences of India; Its People, Castes, Thugs, and Fakirs; Its Religions, Mythology, Principal Monuments, Palaces, and Mausoleums: together with the Incidents of the great Sepoy Rebellion, and its results to Christianity and Civilization.* By REV. WILLIAM BUTLER, D. D. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872. 8vo. pp. 550.

PERHAPS no country has excited more interest within the last twenty-five years than India. Thrown open to the travel and commerce of the world, it has yielded not only riches in merchandise, but almost incomparable riches to literature and religion. The study of language has received a new impetus, and the science of religion has been developed chiefly from a study of the Vedas. Nor do we believe that half has yet been told. A country so abundant in all the elements of material prosperity, inhabited by a population of such historic importance, will most likely continue to attract attention for many years yet to come. Hence we hail with pleasure any book that will help us to understand this land and the people.

The splendidly printed and illustrated volume before us is mainly a narrative of personal experience of fifteen years' residence in India. Dr. Butler was present at the siege of Nynsee-Tal, during the Summer of 1857. Four other American missionaries were operating in the same neighborhood with him, all of whom fell during the Sepoy Rebellion. Dr. Butler was rescued with the garrison at Nynsee-Tal by the gallant Havelock and his brave heroes. Not the least interesting portion of the book is that which details the fearful scenes in and around Lucknow, Cawnpore, Rampore, etc., though the chief value of the book consists in its faithful portraiture of the manners, customs, and religion of the people. The style is artlessly simple, and is sometimes rather tame, though the evident sincerity of the writer, and his anxiety to supply as many details as possible, half apologize for some pages that might have been omitted altogether. But, notwithstanding some unquestionable defects, the book will most likely prove to be a decided success. In fact, it is better adapted to the masses than any work on India that has yet appeared. The illustrations are quite abundant, and being generally taken from photographs, may be considered as altogether reliable. These add much to the value of the work.

- 5.—*Lectures on the Science of Religion*: with a Paper on Buddhist Nihilism, and a Translation of the Dhammapada, or "Path of Virtue." By MAX MÜLLER, M. A. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872. 12mo. pp. 300.

MAX MÜLLER's contributions to the science of religion are unquestionably of great interest. His scholarship and industry are fully equal to the task he has undertaken, and he is from time to time giving us the rich fruits of his labors. While much has been accomplished in the field of investigation in which he has entered, it must be evident to any one who has given the matter serious attention, that real results are just beginning to come in, and that the future ought to yield an abundant harvest in this department of study.

It is not yet quite certain how much value may be attached to the science of religion. The practical benefit to mankind may not be very great. Still it will scarcely be denied that the promise in this direction is very encouraging. Should it be definitely determined that all the languages and religions of the earth are so inter-related as to make it certain that they have all a common origin, it seems to us that both philology and religion will be largely the gainers by such a result. Max Müller is doing as much as any other man toward reaching definite conclusions on these subjects.

- 
- 6.—*Jesus Christ: His Life and Work.* By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D. D. Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871. 16mo. pp. 320.

THE name of Pressensé is already familiar to the readers of the *QUARTERLY*. He is the leader of Protestantism in France and editor of the *Revue Chrétienne*. Few men of this age have a clearer conception of the Christian religion than has he, and with an outspoken candor which defies all human creeds, he writes down his honest convictions. His influence has already been very great in giving direction to the Protestantism of Europe, and we hope that he may yet be able to bring the Churches there up to his standard of thinking.

The volume before us is an abridgment of the author's larger work on the same subject. This edition, which is intended mainly for popular use, avoids, as far as possible, all debatable and controversial points, but embodies the author's most cherished convictions, and is full enough for all practical purposes.

Pressensé's style is remarkably clear, always brilliant, and sometimes truly eloquent. There are passages in this volume which seldom if ever have been equaled as life-pictures of the scenes and incidents connected with the earthly ministry of Christ.

- 7.—*Radical Problems.* By C. A. BARTOL. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1872. 16mo. pp. 407.

THE subjects discussed in this volume are such as are, for the most part, of general interest. "Individualism," "Transcendentalism," "Radicalism," "Theism," "Naturalism," "Materialism," and "Spiritualism," are some of the themes treated, and sufficiently indicate the scope of the work.

Mr. Bartol is a curious philosopher. He thinks that in society and human government there should be definite and fixed laws with the most solemn sanctions, but in religion "to be afloat" is the greatest safety. He finds fault with nearly every thing, and is quite fruitful in "g'ittering generalities" as substitutes for the present order of things. He evidently sees men as trees walking. His vision of ecclesiastical disorders is in direct range of the objects which need close scrutiny, but the magnifying lens of his eye is altogether too powerful to do justice to any thing that has in it the color of conservatism. Mr. Bartol is an extremist. Hence, while his book will do some good—for it attacks with iconoclastic fury many of our household gods which need to be shivered—still it will do very little toward remedying the evils complained of. It is one thing to make us dissatisfied with a certain state of things, but quite another to bring us to accept something that is infinitely better. Mr. Bartol may show us how to make faces at the present manifestations of religion, but he utterly fails to tell us where the "smile of peace" comes in.

- 8.—*Books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth.* By JOHN PETER LANGE, D. D. Translated, Enlarged, and Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872. 8vo. pp. 188, 261, 53.

EVERY successive volume of Lange's great Bible work adds to the reputation of the authors. For sound scholarship, careful criticism, and exhaustive research, this series stands unrivaled.

The commentary on Joshua was prepared by the Rev. F. R. Fay (Dr. Lange's son-in-law), pastor in Crefeld, Prussia, and was translated by the Rev. George R. Bliss, D. D., Professor in Louisburg University, Penn. A careful use has been made of the most recent helps touching the questions of geography and topography of the Holy Land—a matter of great importance in any successful commentary on the book of Joshua.

The commentary on Judges and Ruth is by Prof. Paulus Cassell, of Berlin, and the English edition by the Rev. P. H. Steenstra, Professor in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School at Cambridge, Mass. Prof. Cassell is a converted Rabbi, and is said to be one of the best Talmudic scholars of Germany. His work is certainly marked by great originality, and though his interpretations are sometimes quite fanciful, his commentary may be commended for freshness, vigor, and an ardent Christian spirit.

- 9.—*Three-score Years and Beyond*; or, Experiences of the Aged. A Book for Old People, describing the Labors, Home Life, and Closing Experiences of a large number of Aged Representative Men and Women. Illustrated edition. By REV. W. H. DE PUY, D. D. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872. 8vo. pp. 512.

THE motive of the author in preparing this volume must be highly commended. It seems to us that the object had in view is a most worthy one, and he has certainly, for the most part, done his work well. Few persons of the class, for whom he specially intends his work, can fail to be benefited by a perusal of the experiences of the noble men whose records are given, and who have passed into the spirit-land. The genealogical table of the patriarchs, found in the chapter on "The Aged of the Bible," is conveniently arranged and adds to the interest of the work. The greatest objection to the book is that it is too distinctly denominational. While a few characters have been selected from other communions, nearly every thing that is good comes out of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This was doubtless in the intention of the author; still we think the book would have had a wider usefulness had the selection of characters been more general. In regard to the mechanical execution of the book, it is simply beautiful. The type is large and clear, and the paper, binding, etc., all that could be desired. It is indeed a handsome volume—just such a book as the aged fathers and mothers in Israel will delight to read.

- 
- 10.—*June on the Miami, and other Poems.* By W. H. VENABLE. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co. 1872. 16mo. pp. 122.

THIS beautiful little volume is from the pen of one of our Western poets, and takes its name from one of the loveliest streams in our Mississippi Valley. We take special pleasure in mentioning this, from the fact that it has been very generally supposed that there is no material for poetry in the West. Mr. Venable's name is not very widely known as a poet; but, if we may be allowed to judge by the talent shown in the volume before us, he will one day make it better known. Several of the poems we have seen before in our public prints, and are glad they have been collected and published in this permanent form. The leading poem, "June on the Miami," is full of fine feeling and poetic exaltation, and breathes more than a hint of those "perfect days" which come in June. Mr. Venable has, too, very happy descriptive powers, for we can not but feel ourselves his "companion" on the "sunny banks." We would mention particularly, also, the poem "The Teacher's Dream." Could it be that any one, whatever his imaginative powers, could so picture the experience of a teacher almost ready to give up to despair because of the vexatious trials of his every-day life, unless it were his own heart's story?

Several of the other poems are of special merit, as "*Coffea Arabica*," etc., but the two we have before mentioned seem to us to be leading poems of the book. Mr. Venable's style, if not perfectly original, is simple and unpretentious, which is quite refreshing in this age of pretense, and he gives in the volume before us considerable promise that he may reach a good degree of success among our Western poets.

- 
- 11.—*Half Truths and the Truth.* Lectures on the Origin and Development of Prevailing Forms of Unbelief, considered in Relation to the Nature and Claims of the Christian System. By REV. J. M. MANNING, D. D. Boston: Lee & Shepherd. 12mo. pp. 398.

THE author's purpose in these lectures is to treat of popular infidelity—its sources, its development, and its relation to what is known as the Biblical or Christian system. He denies that he has undertaken the work in any controversial or partisan spirit; and it must be admitted that his style is as true to this claim as could reasonably be expected. The discussion relates chiefly to the various forms of Pantheism; and, as the author's method is evidently intended to reach the people, the treatment is largely free from metaphysical subtleties, which are relished only by philosophical minds. We think the work contains a considerable amount of lumber, which might be dispensed with, without materially interfering with the value of the book. We think, also, that more conspicuity is given to some German writers than is needful in a work intended for American readers.

The author thinks that the sources of infidelity are reducible to two; namely: Pantheism, represented by Spinoza, and Positivism, represented by Comte. Deism, he thinks, rests on no steady foundation of its own, but is always falling away either into Pantheism or Positivism, where it is not happily exalted into Christianity.

- 
- 12.—*God with Us; or, the Person and Work of Christ, with an Examination of "The Vicarious Sacrifice"* of Dr. Bushnell. By ALVAH HOVEY, D. D., President of Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1872. 16mo. pp. 271.

THIS work is divided into three parts, discussing respectively "The Person of Christ," "The Work of Christ," and "The Vicarious Sacrifice." Under the last division the author pays his respects to Dr. Bushnell. The discussion is not very profound, nor very satisfactory; still it is not without value, as it systematizes and condenses the main points of the atonement controversy. Did it belong to the design of this notice, it would be easy to show where Dr. Hovey is quite as fanciful as Dr. Bushnell. The subject is one of very great interest, and ought to command very general attention.

Dr. Hovey's views of the atonement may be summed up as follows:

1. It removed an obstacle from the mind of God to the bestowal of renewing and pardoning grace on man.
2. It effected this removal by meeting in some way the claims of Divine righteousness, and so exhibiting that righteousness.
3. It met those claims, in great part at least, by the voluntary death of Christ, which death he suffered as the penalty due to men for their sins.
4. The vicarious suffering of Christ was intended to be an ample basis or reason for the pardon of all mankind, should they believe in Jesus.

- 
- 13.—*Critical History and Defense of the Old Testament Canon.* By MOSES STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1872. 12mo. pp. 422.

THIS is a new and revised edition of a valuable standard work. Little change, however, has been made from the English edition, except that the notes made by Dr. Davidson give place to such as are supposed to be more suitable. We are glad to have the work in this form, as we regard it one of the very best of its kind in the English language.

- 
- 14.—*The Wonders of Vegetation.* From the French of Fulgence Marion. Edited with Numerous Additions, by SCHELE DE VERE, D. D., LL. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872. 16mo. pp. 283.

WE think it would be difficult to find a more beautiful and instructive volume than this for the young. Indeed, it is well suited to "children of a larger growth," if they wish simply to obtain a general knowledge of the vegetable kingdom. It fills a worthy place in the "Illustrated Library of Wonders."

- 
- 15.—*Prophetic Imperialism; or, the Prophetic Entail of Imperial Power.* By JOSEPH L. LORD, of the Boston Bar. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1871. 16mo. pp. 96.

THIS volume is intended to present a brief sketch of the Divine method of human government during the whole period of Gentile ascendancy and domination over God's covenant people Israel. It presents much that is worthy of serious consideration.

- 
- 16.—*Pillars in the Temple; or, Sketches of Deceased Laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* By REV. WILLIAM C. SMITH. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1872. 16mo. pp. 366.

TO members of the Methodist Church this volume will doubtless be very welcome. And it may also be read with profit by all earnest, pious people, no matter what their religious connections may be.



## FOREIGN LITERATURE.

## BOOKS.

- 1.—*Rome et la République Française. Par JULES FAVRE, de l'Académie Française.*  
(Rome and the French Republic, By JULES FAVRE, of the French Academy.) Paris. 1871. 8vo. pp. 432.

THE historical question which this book develops, accurately indicated by its title, has excited in an extraordinary degree the spirits of men during the last decade, and its final solution, here given in official documents from the archives of the French Government, constitutes an essential part of the wonderful events that have made the years 1870, 1871, a great epoch in modern history. Rome and France, in their intimate and important relations to each other, the latter the powerful supporter of the former, and the effects which the great events of the Œcumenical Council, of the Franco-Prussian war, and of the rising of the Kingdom of Italy have had upon these relations, especially as bringing about the abolition of the temporal power of the Papacy, together constitute the burden of this volume.

Jules Favre speaks by authority. After the fall of the Empire he was made Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Government of the National Defense, and was retained in this office by President Thiers. He resigned his portfolio September 22, 1871, in consequence of an essential disagreement between him, and Thiers, and the National Assembly, relative to the disposition of the petition of the bishops praying the government to support the Pope. Favre desired the petition to be laid aside by a vote to "pass to the order of the day;" Thiers was in favor of referring the petition to the ministry. The Assembly sustained Thiers. In spite of this disagreement, and his resignation of his portfolio, Favre pays a splendid tribute to Thiers and his great address before the Assembly on this memorable occasion. This is one of the finest and noblest passages in his book.

The author very properly opens by giving the relations between the Imperial Government in its last days and the Papal and Italian courts in reference to the "Roman question." The history of this question is then brought to its final *denouement*—the occupation of Rome as the Italian capital, and the events, so far as they especially relate to the conduct of the "European powers," connected therewith. We have in this volume what has never before been published to the world—the diplomatic correspondence between France, Rome, and Italy, and of some of the other European governments, especially Bavaria and Austria, on this vexed "Roman question." These authoritative documents lay bare to us the history of the last

days, or years, of the temporal power of the Papacy, and how it was finally abandoned by its long friends, and fell by the force of events, that, though unlooked for by many of the wisest, were nevertheless in the straight line of the resistless current of the world's history, and consequently altogether beyond the control of Roman diplomacy. In the copious appendix are given the "pieces justificatives," the documents referred to in the work. These are very valuable, and embrace at length addresses by Thiers and Favre in the French Chamber, diplomatic correspondences, and Papal missives, such as encyclicals, etc.

That the destiny of Rome was involved in that of France, as the issue of events has shown, was well known in France. In a dispatch of July 31, 1870, by the Duc de Grammont, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the French representative at the Papal court, it is declared :

"The destinies of France and those of the Holy See are bound together in these grave and solemn conjunctures, and the surest guarantees for the Pontifical government is in with the good understanding of Italy and France, in placing themselves on the ground of their mutual engagements, the triumph of the French armies in the struggle which they are called to sustain. . . . If France is vanquished the Papacy is fatally lost with it."

Cardinal Antonelli fully understood the truth of this. De Banneville, the French representative at Rome, in a dispatch to his government, dated August 5th, the day before the disastrous battle of Woerth, says :

"Cardinal Antonelli had no difficulty in recognizing, in the most explicit terms, that a defeat of France would be the beginning of a European cataclysm, the consequences of which would be incalculable, and in which the Holy See would have all to lose, and would certainly lose all. 'If there are any,' said he, 'who do not see this, who dream for us a human support outside of France, they must be very blind.'"

"Thus," adds M. Favre, "the last word of this sad negotiation, pronounced by the representative of the Holy See himself, expressed the close union (*l'étroite solidarité*) of the cause of France and that of the Papacy." . . . "The capitulation of Sedan, the captivity of the Emperor, the *dechéance* of the imperial government, prepared by the legislature, declared by acclamation on the fourth of September by the population of Paris, and the following day by all France, were so many thunder-bolts, which, while strewing the earth with ruins, created for statesmen embarrassments and necessities from which it was no longer possible for them to extricate themselves. . . . In this tempest the temporal power had disappeared, and behind the venerable walls of the Vatican there was left only an old man, a pontiff prostrate before God, henceforth his only support and the only principle of his greatness."

The government of Napoleon III, however disposed as it was to give the Pope support, was not in accord with the spirit and the aims of the Pope and his government. It was constantly urging the Pope to reconcile himself with the Italian government, and to adopt a liberal government, in harmony with the spirit of the age. Nothing is clearer than this, as is amply revealed from the diplomatic correspondence between Paris and Rome. It could not be otherwise. France, enlightened and progressive, could consent to nothing else. In a very remarkable document, dated May 10, 1862, the Emperor

himself entered into the discussion of this "difficult problem,"\* of the two-fold Roman government, and the "reconciling" of it with the present world. In this document he says:

"The Holy See has an equal, if not a greater, interest in this reconciliation; for if the Holy See has zealous supporters among all the fervent Catholics, it has against it all that is liberal in Europe; it passes for being in politics the representative of the prejudices of the old order of things, (*de l'ancien régime*), and in the eyes of Italy as being the enemy of its independence, and the most devoted partisan of reaction. It is also surrounded by the most excited and extravagant adherents of the fallen dynasties, and this association is not calculated to increase in its favor the sympathies of the peoples that have overthrown these dynasties. Yet this state of things injures less the sovereign than the religious chief. In the Catholic countries where the new ideas have a great empire, the men, even the most sincerely attached to their faith, feel their consciences troubled, and doubt enters their minds, uncertain whether they are able to harmonize their political convictions with their religious principles, which appear to condemn modern civilization."

The government of the Emperor represented with great clearness and vigor to the Pope the grave errors, and the conflict with all free government, embraced in the *schema* proposed to the Œcumenical Council, and the disastrous results that would follow. This is set forth with power by Count Daru in a despatch dated February 20, 1870. It is an admirable *exposé* of this outrageous *schema* against human freedom.

Favre himself is, in full conviction, ever a friend to Italian unity—and in this he differs from Thiers—and of non-intervention in the affairs of Rome, and an enemy to the temporal power of the Pope. His skillful management, while minister of foreign affairs, of the "difficult problem" and the vexed "Roman question" is in the spirit of this conviction. In his book he shows that the restoration of the Pope to his lost power is now hopeless. He says:

"What the Pope wants, and what the petitions ask for him, is the reconstitution of the pontifical domain, the restoration of the theocratic power. I have shown by irrefutable proofs that if France had the folly to attempt such an enterprise she would be isolated in the midst of Europe, that would separate from her with contempt."

M. Favre is a Catholic, but like other eminent and enlightened Catholics of Europe he understands and rejects, as a crime against God and man, the arrogant assumptions of the Papal hierarchy. In the last chapter of his book he has exposed in a terrible manner the abominations of the Papal rule in Rome—the rule that the Bishops' Petition asks France to seek to restore—and this he does by citing as witnesses eminent Catholics themselves, ecclesiastics and others, who have been eye-witnesses of this "paternal government."

The book is written in the lofty spirit of enlightened free thought, and it will be welcomed as a most valuable aid in the study of the great living questions of which it treats.

\* *L'Empereur Napoléon III et l'Italie*. p. 26. "This—the reconciling of the double government of the Pope—is the problem. A difficult problem, we agree, but on the solution of which depends, perhaps, the safety of the temporal power of the Papacy." This famous pamphlet, published 1859, was said to be inspired by the Emperor himself, if not dictated by him.

- 2.—*Foi et Patrie: discours prononcés pendant le siège de Paris. Par ERNEST DHOMBRES, pasteur de l'Eglise réformée. Avec une préface et des notes explicatives résumant l'histoire de ce siège memorable.* (Faith and Fatherland: Sermons delivered during the Siege of Paris. By ERNEST DHOMBRES, Minister of the Reformed Church With a Preface and Explanatory Notes, giving a Summary of this Memorable Siege.) Paris. 1871. 12mo. pp. 228.

THESE sermons were delivered by one of the most gifted of the evangelical ministers of Paris, and illustrate, in an eminent degree, the simplicity and clearness of style, the earnestness, ardor, pointedness, and eloquence, and the aptness for profound illustration in applying the sacred Scriptures, which is so characteristic of the better class of the French ministry. They were the fruit of the most important occasions of the siege of Paris, and therefore bear within them all the peculiar inspiration and meaning, in the light of religious feeling and the teachings of the Word of God, of the extraordinary moments that called them forth. They can be read, therefore, as an exposition of the sentiments and feelings of the evangelical Protestants of Paris and of France during these crises of the war.

The title of the book and the titles of the several sermons are striking, and show the admirable taste of the French mind. The Sermons, eight in number, are entitled respectively: *Jesus weeping over Jerusalem*, September 4, 1870, the day of the fall of the Empire; *Foy, Patience, and Prayer*, September 25, the investment of Paris; *The Invisible Armies*, October 23, the failure of Favre's mission for peace; *The Discouragement of Elijah*, November 20, failure of the attempt to break the siege; *Why this Waste?* December 4, great loss to the besieged in another attempt to break the line; *Christmas of the Besieged*, December 25; *A sad Beginning of the New Year*, January 15, 1871; *The Grain of Corn in the Furrow*, February 25, the end of the siege—this last is one of the best of these sermons.

We have space to give but an extract—though tempted to go farther—from these admirable discourses, which should be read entire by those among us who have a full command of the French language. In the sermon, *Why this Waste?* based on Mark xiv, 3-9, the eloquent preacher speaks of the propriety of great sacrifices at great crises, when we see no apparent, immediate, justifiable result—as the waste of ointment on Jesus' head, misunderstood and censured by the disciples. It is a grand thought, and nobly developed:

"There are two regions, there are two spheres in the life of individuals as in the life of peoples; the region of immediate interests, of the useful, the habitual, the ordinary, and the region of superior interests, of the extraordinary, of the sublime. God forbid that we should despise the first! But we would not be worthy to bear the name of *man* if we could never lift ourselves up to the second. But there are hours in the destiny of individuals and of nations, when the extraordinary is alone in place; and when such hours come, it is impossible, under pain of the forfeiture of our claim to manhood, to withdraw from the heroic duties which they impose. If you would take away this sublime daring, you would efface the fairest pages of human history.

"Dissuade these Greeks, who, at the entrance of a defile whose name is immortal, determine to arrest by their heroic death the servile hordes of Persians, and charge one of their number to write on a rock with the point of his sword, 'Wanderer, tell at Sparta that we have died here to obey its laws.'

"Restrain this young shepherdess of seventeen years, who has imagined the wild dream of delivering France from the yoke of the English, from clothing herself in heavy armor to place herself at the head of armies, and to have her king anointed in his delivered land.

"Tell these early Christians: 'How can you expect, *poor sheep sent out in the midst of wolves*, that you are going to change the face of the world, and by the simple weapon of your martyrdom to triumph over a universal and implacable persecution?'

"Tell these Reformers of the sixteenth century: 'Keep for your own selves the purer faith which you have had the good fortune to draw from the sacred Scriptures and an intimate communion with Christ, or, at least, content yourselves with having it penetrate little by little into this vast Church which surrounds you. But to break with all Christendom, to triumph over popes, councils, emperors, and to establish the Church of the apostolic days—is this any thing else than an impossible enterprise or a generous illusion?'

"Tell these missionaries who are going to tear themselves away from their native country to carry the Gospel to the ends of the world: 'Why this strange ambition? is there not around you here a surer good to effect? can you not advance the kingdom of God in your own country? will not Christianity make its way of its own accord, through the coming centuries, to these distant nations? these uncertain conquests—are they worth the sacrifice of such precious lives?'

"Is this, ye positive souls, the language that *you* would speak? . . . No, no, you would not venture such speech; for to suppress those holy follies would be to suppress the titles of nobility, of humanity; it would be under the pretext of preserving for it certain inferior advantages, to despoil it of immortal riches; it would be to give up the fairest spectacles and the most salutary examples which it has given! Yes, even when heroism has displayed itself in pure loss, it is yet to be preferred to the vulgar satisfactions of a national life without dignity and greatness!

"But no, my brethren, heroism never displays itself in pure loss. There is in it a fecundity that will some day be seen. Duty and sacrifice, in their apparent sterility, bear sooner or later their fruits; for, after all, it is principles that rule facts—it is great moral actions that rule the world."

The abundant notes are exceedingly valuable in revealing the state of the public, and especially of the religious mind in Paris, during these memorable and eventful days; and the whole together shows us, what should be an interest to us to know, how enlightened Protestant France judged this war, and how she bore herself in it:

---

3.—*Irenæus, der Bischof von Lyon. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der alt-Katholischen Kirche.* Von HEINRICH ZIEGLER, *Gymnasiallehrer.* (Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons. A Contribution to the History of the Rise of the Old-Catholic Church. By HEINRICH ZIEGLER, Teacher at the Gymnasium.) Berlin. 1871. 8vo. pp. 320.

THIS, certainly, may be regarded as a valuable "contribution," as the author calls it, to the theological literature of our times. Eusebius, in his ecclesiastical history, 5, 24, says of Irenæus, that "he bears with right his name," which signifies *man of peace*; yet he stands among the foremost warriors of his day in the battle line of "the Church" in its mighty conflicts.

with the powerful heretical assailants, who sought to break its integrity and corrupt its doctrine. Eusebius is, nevertheless, right; for though positive and uncompromising in the defense of what he regards truth, and against what he holds as errors, throughout all he has written that is left to us there breathes the thirst and hunger for peace, unity, and love among God's people. As a polemic, he represents the spirit of Melancthon or Beza rather than that of Luther or Calvin. He was educated in the Christian school of the Churches in Asia Minor, on which rested especially the spirit of Paul and John, and at the feet of Polycarp, the disciple of the latter apostle, he often sat in his youth; and in his old age, in Lyons, in Gaul, he remembered with tenderest affections the instructions of his beloved teacher. "When I was yet a boy," he says to Florinus, who had become a heretic, "I saw you in Asia Minor, with Polycarp; for I remember what happened then more than the events of to-day. What we have learned in childhood grows, as it were, with the soul, and becomes one with it, so that I can describe the place where the holy Polycarp sat and taught; his coming in and going out; his manner of life, and the form of his body; the discourses which he delivered to the Church; how he related his intercourse with the Apostle John, and with the others who had seen the Lord; how he reported their sayings, and what he had learned from them about the Lord, and his wonders, and teaching. As he had received all this from the eye-witnesses of his life, he related all in harmony with the Scriptures. This I heard then, with all earnestness, through the grace of God vouchsafed to me, and I wrote it down, not on paper, but in my heart, and constantly I bring it again, by divine grace, into lively remembrance." A study of his writings reveal that this early instruction exercised an abiding influence on his mind through a long life.

What we are to understand by the Old or Primitive Catholic Church is thus expressed by our author:

"It was not until and through the Easter controversy that excited all Christendom, in the last quarter of the second century, that the opposition between the *Pauline* and the *Jewish-Christian* tendencies is brought to rest. And now begins the formation, in rapid progress, of the first distinct, independent constitution of the universal Christian community, that had been, hitherto, in process of preparation; there arises the universal *Old-Catholic Church*, that embraces in it all provincial Churches, and all single congregations, and unites all hitherto divergent tendencies."

It is this ancient Church, this primitive, or, rather, *early* (this latter word is, for obvious reasons, preferred by some to the former) ecclesiasticism and unity that is an object of such interest to the Greek, and the Catholic, and the German, and the Anglican Protestant Churches; for all seek in it the ideals of their ecclesiastical and doctrinal life. Before this the Church had not yet attained to its permanent unity of form, doctrine, and life; was still in process of development, rising and growing up into the fullness of its



stature as the perfected body of Christ. Our author expresses it in the following manner :

"The kingdom of God, which Jesus Christ instituted, was not delivered by him to his disciples and all coming generations as a perfected work, to be by them only preserved, but, according to the parable of the Founder himself, it was in the beginning undeveloped, like the grain of corn, out of which the plant was first to grow up. But the development of this kingdom refers not only to its extension, but also to the manner of its constitution among men, of its influence upon these, its internal nature and formation. . . . The original apostolic Church was essentially *Jewish-Christian, legalistic*. It was not until a considerable time after the origin of this community, and then at first only in a very narrow circle, that the clear consciousness arose of the entire independence of Christianity of, and of its relative antithesis to, all that had been before it, Judaism included. In the entire period, from the foundation of the Christian Church to the middle of the second century, its struggle and conflicts, alongside of its extension among the nations, are devoted almost exclusively to the work of freeing itself from this foreign, and gaining of its own form. The conversion of the Apostle Paul, and the opening of his apostleship, mark the active beginning-point of this effort. . . . This conflict is not even yet ended, in the time of Justin Martyr. Only very gradually the conflicting opposite tendencies approach each other."

The final formation of the Old-Catholic Church, according to our author, is the end of this conflict after unity.

We can not avoid translating a significant passage from the preface :

"The formation of the Old-Catholic Church," says the author, "is of the highest interest to all those who have an appreciation for a really historical development of our religion, and who do not assume at the start, as an unassailable article of faith, the identity of the apostolical Church in its doctrine and constitution with the Church of the second and third centuries. Only a strict observation of the formation of the Church in doctrine and constitution, at the point wherefrom the kingdom of Christ and the apostolic Church was born, in the midst of mighty internal conflicts, the Catholic Church of antiquity, in its essence legalistic, provided with strong institution, and designed for the dominion of the world, throws a proper light on the *primitive* Christian time. Such an observation alone enables us to draw a line of limit and distinction between what is primitively Christian and apostolic and what is Catholic-ecclesiastical ; it alone, also, can give us a standard for our judgment to determine how far the Churches of Protestantism have gone, not only beyond the corrupt Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, but also beyond the Old-Catholic Church, and returned to primitive Christianity. It enables us, however, also to discover how many elements of the first permanent constitution of the Old-Catholic Church the Reformation Churches have, without examination, accepted as truth."

The religious controversies of our own day, in the bosom of Protestantism, have shown the truth of these weighty words of our author.

This book is perhaps the completest work on Irenæus we possess. The object of the writer is to give in the life of this eminent Church father, as a representative man, a view of the condition and conflicts of the Church in the latter half of the second and the beginning of the third centuries. The work has two main divisions. In the first of these the author treats of the external relations of the life of Irenæus, and of his ecclesiastical activity ; in the second of his doctrine, embracing, 1. *The Source and Rule of Christian Knowledge* ; 2. *The Theology of Irenæus* ; 3. *His Anthropology* ; 4.

His Christology ; 5. His Eschatology. The author has done his work with learning, patient research, and clear discrimination, and with conscientiousness.

- 
- 4.—*Der Prophet Daniel.* Von DR. O. ZÖCKLER. *Lange's Bibel-Werk; des alten Testamentes, XVII Theil.* 1870. (The Prophet Daniel. By DR. O. ZÖCKLER. Lange's Bible Work, XVII Part of the Old Testament, 1870.)

DANIEL occupies an important place among the Old Testament prophets, ranking in the extent and importance of his prophecies among the four great prophets, and fourth in order. The period and place of his life, the high rank he occupied, and the mighty events that were the burden of his prophecy—all have contributed to make his book of the highest interest both to Jews and Christians. It was written during the great Babylonian exile, that period so momentous, every way, to the Jewish nation, and not in the land of the Jews, but in Babylon itself, the land of the captivity. The prophet was, by the evident interposition and special purpose of the Most High, for his people's sake, lifted up to become prime minister of the Babylonian empire, and the far-reaching burden of his prophecy, in his own visions and those of the Assyrian monarch interpreted by him, are the great dynastic successions in the Gentile world, as preceding and foreshadowing the glorious, universal Messianic kingdom. Not only the sublime imagery of the visions in Daniel, but their unity, and, above all, the remarkable chronological exactness of his prophecies—in marked contrast to the other prophetic books—have from of old drawn, in a peculiar manner, the attention of interpreters to this book. The Jewish people, during the centuries of their national enslavement by their Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman masters, studied with anxious and hopeful care the book of Daniel because it predicted, and with such wonderful chronological minuteness, a glorious Messianic deliverance. The great influence of these Messianic prophecies on the Jewish nation at the period of Christ's advent, as indicated both in the New Testament and the Jewish writings of that age, can not be mistaken. But to Christians, likewise, and especially in their early conflicts with the Jews, has this prophetic book always had a peculiar interest ; because it so precisely fixes the advent of the Messiah, and then, ever afterward, because it predicts the triumphant, universal reign of the Messiah, when "the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High God, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all kingdoms shall serve and obey him" (ch. 7, xxvii), and this interest will continue while this age endures.

But no book in the Old Testament canon has suffered more violence at the hand of the destructive rationalistic criticism than Daniel ; its importance

to the Old Testament and the New, to the Jewish and the Christian faith, and the peculiarities of its internal character have been the occasion of this.

We have no space in this notice to cite the points made against the book. We refer to this rationalistic crusade against Daniel because it is a German crusade, and because it has been carried on by means of that destructive, errant, "internal criticism," for which the German writers are so notorious. In a commentary on such books as Daniel, from a German source, we look at once to the ground taken in this respect by the author. Dr. Zæckler evidently belongs to the better, more evangelical school, yet in the preface, he says:

"While the author holds fast the more decidedly the authenticity of the book on the whole, because of the very difficulties he has had to overcome in modifying his former view in favor of the composition of it in the times of the Maccabees—a modification based on the very thorough investigations of a Niebuhr, Pusey, Zuendel, Kranichfeld, Volck, Fueller, etc., that establish its origin during the exile—he must nevertheless maintain his former doubts with reference to the greater part of the eleventh chapter (namely, vs. 5–39). The grounds that determine him to this, it is true, are only of an internal kind; they are found in the fact, that the prophecy, as contained in this section, embracing a period of several centuries, in the minuteness of its details offers such a striking contrast to all that the prophetic literature of the Old Testament elsewhere contains of special prediction, that only the assumption of an interpolating revision of its prophetic contents in the times of the Seleucidan persecution, or shortly afterward, can give a really satisfactory explanation of its particular parts. The subjectivity of a criticism like that on which this judgment rests may be censured, in view of the fact that all external testimonies unanimously testify to the integrity of the text of the prophet; it may be called inconsequent that by such a judgment the compact unity of a work that reveals throughout such an admirable plan, such symmetry and union in all its parts, is broken through precisely in one point only. The *analogia visionis propheticae*, which is the motive for our decision, appears to us, in questions like the one before us, to be a no less certain, objectively valid, and decisive criterion than the *analogia fidei* in the department of Biblical doctrine."

Here we have a full view of this "internal criticism" in all its parts and passions at once. Dr. Zæckler once with great tenacity—so he declares—on the grounds of "internal criticism," decided, no doubt with all the august *ex cathedra* authority of a German "internal" *Kritiker*, in favor of a Maccabean origin; that the *whole* book was unauthentic, as did many other of those profound coryphæi of German *gelehrsamkeit*—of German science. But Niebuhr, Zuendel, etc., went also into this "internal criticism," and discovered that the other "internal" *Kritiker* were fearfully mistaken, and Dr. Zæckler gives up *all except a few verses*, and this we presume—honestly with him—to save his "internal subjective criticism;" for what would a German *Gelehrter* be without "subjectivity?" and this exception is made, confessedly, on no other ground than this eternal "internal criticism," and squarely against the fact that *all* external testimony is unanimously in favor of the absolute integrity of the whole book! Our author delivers himself more directly and fully on the section in "doubt," as follows:

"That a pious theocratic scribe in those days of persecution, excited and surprised by the wonderfully exact coincidence between the prophecy and the history of his times, should

attempt still more closely to fashion this coincidence, and by means of the insertion of a series of *vaticinia ex eventu* into the prophetic text seek still further to remove any apparent incongruence between the predictions and the facts of the near historical past; all this can not in the least lead us to question the incomparably high value and the inspired character of this prophecy," etc.

But Dr. Zæckler is mistaken! this utter defiance of the "unanimous testimony" of all the past; this application of "subjective criticism," that is, of every man judging of what is true and false in a book by the standard of what he thinks ought or ought not to be there, by others as well as himself, will make and has made havoc of the whole, and destroys all faith in any book of the entire canon.

It is a notable fact, as Delitzsch says in *Herzog's Encyclopædia*, and as is well known, that the only opponent the genuineness of the book of Daniel has had for almost two thousand years, was Porphyry, the heathen enemy of Christianity and the Bible, in the third century. The statement by Dr. Davidson that "Hippolytus, a Roman bishop and orthodox Christian writer," also impugned the book of Daniel, is an error into which the learned Doctor seems to have fallen by misapprehending a German writer, Dr. Ewald. The very modern attacks on Daniel have been fully answered, and the genuineness, authenticity, and great value of the prophet fully vindicated by Horne, Jahn, Delitzsch, Tregelles, and others. We especially commend Tregelles's book, as by far the most complete and satisfactory. Dr. Zæckler's Commentary, in spite of the defect we have noticed, is a valuable contribution to the exposition of the prophet, and is already a great progress, in the right direction, from the earlier German commentators and critics of our age, whose arbitrary, destructive "subjective" method left only ruins behind it.

---

#### MAGAZINES.

*The British Quarterly Review.* January. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1872.

THIS exceedingly able Review opens with a very excellent article on Lanfrey's History of Napoleon I. This is followed by a very readable article on Beethoven. But by far the ablest article in the January No. is on The Speaker's Commentary. While highly commending the Commentary, in many respects, the writer does not hesitate to point out some very grave defects. The criticism with reference to the Bible use of the inverted Hebrew letter *Nun* strikes us as very proper and very valuable. The article on Mahomet is well written, and will repay a careful reading.